

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It is a curious fact, which does not seem to have been noted and commented on hitherto, that the theological thought of the nineteenth century underwent simultaneously a double movement in two apparently opposite directions. At the very time when the Fatherhood of God was beginning to be emphasized as against the Sovereignty of God there arose, on the other hand, and quickly advanced to great prominence, the doctrine of the Kingdom of God. The natural connexion of thought is fatherhood and family, sovereignty and kingdom, and we should have expected the generation which gloried in the Fatherhood of God to have laid stress on the Family rather than on the Kingdom of God. But the opposite has been the case. The Kingdom of God is emphasized to-day in association with the Fatherhood of God, whereas a previous generation, which made much of the Divine Sovereignty, had also much to say about the Family of God.

One may, doubtless, trace in these combinations certain spiritual influences working to preserve the due balance of gospel truth. As regards the prominence given to the doctrine of the Kingdom of God it is without question to be understood in large measure as a protest against the undue individualism of a previous time, and as the expression of a growing feeling for the social implications of the gospel. Be that as it may, the fact remains that for more than a generation the idea of the Kingdom of God has reigned supreme in Christian thought, at least in the English-speaking world, and has come

to be regarded as the *Magna Charta* under which all manner of social reforms have been carried forward in the Christian name.

At the Stockholm Conference on Christian Life and Work in 1925 this conception of the Kingdom of God became the subject of sharp controversy. The English and American delegates used the term as comprehending the whole social, moral, and religious progress of the human race. To which the German delegates replied in effect that that was not at all the Kingdom of God as revealed in the New Testament. The Kingdom there spoken of is a heavenly kingdom, brought into being by the grace of God and dependent on Him alone for its progress and final triumph. Both sides were genuinely astonished at what they regarded as the blindness of the other party, and since the Conference various German writers have commented unfavourably on what they call Anglo-Saxon *activism*, that is, the tendency of the energetic Anglo-Saxon mind to pursue a policy of salvation by works.

Principal GARVIE, who was present at the Conference, has given serious thought to the problem thus abruptly raised, and the fruits of his thought are given in his book now published on *The Christian Ideal for Human Society* (Hodder & Stoughton; 16s. net). This book, it may be said in passing, is the companion volume to his work on 'The Christian Doctrine of the Godhead,' and is an extraordinarily able and comprehensive account of Christian ethics

in all its branches and applications. Part iv., which treats of sociology, is unusually complete and will be found rich in wise Christian teaching in regard to many burning questions in the social, national, and international life of to-day. Principal GARVIE says that at first he had intended to use the term, Kingdom of God, in the title of his book, but further study and reflection have led him to 'the conclusion that this term is not the best to describe what is the Christian ideal.' In the choice of a guiding principle he has been led to prefer, not the Kingdom, but the Family of God.

Now it cannot but be regarded as highly significant that so profound a mind as Dr. GARVIE's should have passed through this change, and that he should have detached himself, as he says, from current usage. It cannot be taken as less than a strong challenge to the dominance in our theological thinking of the Kingdom of God and a serious call to rethink the contents of that ideal so as to bring them into harmony with the teaching of the New Testament.

What reasons have led to this change of view? Dr. GARVIE enumerates five. The first is the ambiguity of the term. Here he refers to the discussion at Stockholm. 'It is still much disputed whether the term should be understood ethically or eschatologically, whether the Kingdom is a present, progressive, moral, and religious order for mankind which can be hindered or advanced by human effort, or is a future, supernatural event, the act of God alone, which men can neither hasten nor delay, but the advent of which can be determined only by the counsel of God.' Subsequent to Stockholm a small group of English and German theologians met to discuss the point and reached certain findings which Dr. GARVIE summarizes. 'Only a drastic criticism of the sources can justify the eschatological view, only an undue modernising of the teaching of Jesus the ethical. The data justify an intermediate view—the presence of the Kingdom in its commencement in the ministry of Jesus and the response of men thereto, the consummation of the Kingdom in the future by the action of God, which, however, can be delayed or hastened by human unbelief or faith.'

The second reason is that the term is rooted in the Old Testament conception of the relation of God and man, and not that of the New Testament. 'God as sovereign and man as subject is not the truest description of the relation of God and man as realised in Christ, and as through Him to be realised in all men.' Jesus as the Jewish Messiah used the language most appropriate to His historical situation. But we do not now think of Him as the Jewish Messiah, and when we speak of the kingdom we put into it a meaning which He never did. 'Many activities to-day are justified as services of the Kingdom of God which did not appear on the horizon of His aims and hopes.'

Thirdly, the term itself is a figure of speech, which carries far less meaning for us to-day than it did for the contemporaries of Jesus. 'It meant then an absolute sovereignty, a claim over the whole life, such as no modern monarchy would with safety to itself among civilised nations ever dare to claim. . . . Monarchy is not necessarily the permanent and universal form of government, and is being widely superseded. It is, therefore, not the best analogy of the relations of God to man.'

Fourthly, it is by no means certain that the term really carries the social implications which in our day it has been held to carry and express supremely. The primary meaning is *Kingship* not Kingdom, *Rule* not Realm. 'The term thus does not settle the quarrel between individualism and the more social apprehension of Christian religion and morality. Its use, then, in describing this moral ideal does not determine what the contents of that ideal must be.'

Lastly, it does not correspond to the reality of the relation of God and man as Christian theology defines it. God is revealed in Christ as Father, and man redeemed in Christ as child of God. This is the least inadequate analogy of the relation of God and man, and should be carried through the whole body of Christian doctrine. 'This analogy does not lend itself to individualism, the exclusion of the social applications of the gospel; for, even although God's Fatherhood is an individual relation—and the

stress of Jesus on the one sheep and the one coin must never be allowed to fall out of our thought—yet as God is the universal Father, it carries with it a universal relationship to men—"All ye are brethren." The absolute love to God and the equal love to self and neighbour does not so closely correspond with the relation of sovereign and subject, or of fellow-citizens, as does that of the father and the family.' This is not a mere question of words, but of a dominant conception which will affect, and ought to govern, the whole of our Christian thinking.

Along with Principal Garvie's book there might be considered a chapter in another volume published this month—*The Worth of Prayer*, by Mr. Edward GRUBB, in which there is an extraordinarily interesting and suggestive essay on 'The Christian Idea of God.' We may not agree with all its conclusions, but the points are worth considering, and we shall set them out here as fairly as we can. Mr. GRUBB deals with two things: first, the Idea of God in the mind of Jesus; and second, the question whether this idea has been rendered obsolete by the progress of human knowledge. It might be thought that no one could produce anything new on the first of these matters. But Mr. GRUBB certainly does.

The outstanding feature of the teaching of Jesus about God is His almost constant use of the term 'Father.' This is so obvious that it does not strike us as strange. But as a matter of fact 'King' would have fitted His fundamental announcement of the 'Kingdom of God.' It was apparently with deliberation that He set aside 'King' for the more intimate and endearing 'Father.' Now, what was new in this was His own religious experience, which was clearly unique. While we cannot penetrate the secret of His inner life, there is much to convince us that He felt God as his Father and inward Comforter as no one ever felt Him before or since. He seems to have rejoiced in an experience of filial communion that was never broken by self-will, or clouded by conscious sin. Such was the impression which His life made upon His immediate followers;

such is the impression that the earliest records leave upon ourselves. His teaching about the Fatherhood of God is unique in this—that He alone, if we judge aright, had perfectly experienced it. This note of personal experience, expressed in the often repeated phrase 'My Heavenly Father,' expands and deepens and enriches the loftiest conceptions of God reached by previous prophets.

In two respects, at any rate, an advance is clear. In the first place, even the most inspired of the prophets was scarcely able to shake off the idea of God as an Oriental despot. The very declaration (by a late prophet) 'Thou art our Father' is inserted between two passages in which the prophet takes back what fatherhood implies. In the second place, while Jesus clearly teaches God's willingness to forgive the penitent, He goes much farther than this. *God suffers loss* while any of His children are alienated from Him, and goes out with active love to seek the lost and induce him to come back. This is a new and authentic note in the teaching about God, to which none of the prophets ever attained.

But did Jesus teach that God is *love and nothing else*? This is perhaps the most difficult problem in the critical study of this piece of history, and it is one the solution of which deeply concerns the Christian life. In the teaching of Jesus, as we have it, He undoubtedly envisages a righteous *wrath* in God which will visit the finally unrepentant with the pains of Gehenna. Is this reconcilable with the picture of the Prodigal's father? The difficulty is not met by saying that the love of the Father is stern and holy love, and that sin must meet the Divine reprobation. That is true. But the difficulty is that the Divine judgments on sin spoken of in the Gospels are *not* thought of as loving chastisements, but 'just' retribution for persistent wrongdoing. God's final answer to wilful and persistent evil is to destroy the sinner in Hell.

Mr. GRUBB sees only two possible answers to this difficulty. Either Jesus was inconsistent, or He has been misrepresented. Mr. GRUBB prefers the latter alternative, and says so at some length. But

is there not a third, namely, that this was an integral part of Christ's teaching, and that *it is true*? Why not? Is it not one of the really serious things about the exclusive emphasis on Fatherhood in our day that it has led people to take a very light view of evil? God becomes '*le bon Dieu*,' and will not be hard on anybody. And is not retribution a *fact*, a terrible fact, in life? The Righteousness of God (which the prophets declare) is the foundation of any true thought of God, even of His Fatherhood. This may be included in any true idea of love. But may we not so include the stern element in the teaching of Jesus in His teaching about Fatherhood?

The other question is as to whether the idea of God in the mind of Jesus is valid to-day in view of the progress of human knowledge. What authority has this idea of God for us to-day? The world has grown so vast in its interstellar distances, and at the same time so inconceivably minute in its atomic structure, that the idea of an organizing Personality seems stretched beyond breaking-point. In the time of Jesus it was not difficult to think of God as breaking in upon its usual routine by miracle. Now, science and philosophy together have made the idea of a Divine Power outside the world, interfering now and then with its ordinary working, almost impossible for thoughtful minds.

Mr. GRUBB's answer to this is suggestive. There are, he says, two streams of human experience, and not one only. There is an inner experience as well as an outer. Man's moral and religious experience is just as much a fact of history and of present life as the experience which he gains by the use of his senses and his intellect. His religious creeds and observances could never have arisen and persisted had there not been behind them an awareness of the Divine, an experience felt as a real Presence with which man's life had to be brought into satisfactory relation. This religious experience is real, but it needs constant intellectual criticism, and man's religious history is part of the story of his attempts to 'rationalize' the conception he forms of God. Doubtless the idea of Personality is a stage in that process of 'rationalization.' It is, however, the

highest concept within our reach, and the rejection of the idea of Personality generally ends in thinking of God as infra-personal, or as an abstraction.

Now, the religious life needs to be nourished through 'correspondence' with the spiritual environment, and for this purpose the conception of God which Jesus brought is valid and even final. But this is not to say that for other purposes the idea of God may not need supplementing. Jesus was not a philosopher, but man needs philosophy, and for the purposes of philosophy he needs an organizing principle of Order and Unity, which the conception of Personality does not adequately provide. It would seem, then, that for the present—until our powers of spiritual apprehension are greater than they are now—the ideas of God as Person and as Law must be held side by side, whatever difficulty we may have in reconciling them. It may be that they are destined to be resolved in some higher synthesis, at present unattainable, differing from either, but doing full justice to both. Faith refuses to be 'rushed' by dilemmas, even if it cannot yet, out of the 'broken arcs,' fashion the 'perfect round.'

This is, as we said, suggestive, and more or less satisfying. But something may perhaps be added. Does not Mr. GRUBB tend to assume the idea of Personality as an exclusive thing? You are you, and I am I, different 'persons,' marked out from each other. But surely the true and philosophical idea of personality is *inclusive*. Individuality is exclusive. Our individualities exclude one another. But what makes a personality is not individuality but experience. We grow into persons by the enrichment of experiences. If, then, we get rid of this geographical idea of Personality, and think of it as consisting (as it does) of spiritual intensity, the difficulty Mr. GRUBB raises is not by any means so acute.

In Canon J. A. MACCULLOCH's recent volume, reviewed in another column, on *The Harrowing of Hell*, there is a fresh discussion of the meaning of the two Petrine passages which supply part of the

Scriptural foundation for the doctrine (found so frequently in the theological and popular writings of the early Church, and so frequently subjected in the Middle Ages to poetical and artistic treatment) of Christ's Descent to the hollow Underworld known now as Hell, now as Hades, and of His preaching there to the 'spirits in prison.' The passages are 1 P 3^{18f.}: 'Because Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God; being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit; in which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which aforetime were disobedient, when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah' (R.V.); and 1 P 4⁶: 'For unto this end was the gospel preached even to the dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit' (R.V.).

These passages, especially the first, are regarded by some as wholly enigmatic; others find no reference in them to the Descent of Christ. St. Augustine, and St. Thomas following him, supposed that in the first passage the *pre-existent* Christ is represented as coming in the Spirit and preaching to the disobedient before the Flood. The spirits are said to be 'in prison' because they were in the darkness of ignorance while yet in the bodies of men. But 'quickened in the spirit' must refer to the incarnate Christ, and it is significant that the Syriac Version reads Sheol or Hades for 'prison.'

Luther's interpretation is similar to St. Augustine's in taking the 'spirits in prison' to be spirits of Jews and Gentiles still living on earth, to whom the apostles, inspired by the Spirit, preach in vain; they are disobedient, like those of Noah's day. Another interpretation (F. Spitta) makes the preaching that of the pre-existent Christ to the fallen angels of whom Jewish tradition, resting on Gn 6², spoke so much, and who were shut up in ward against the Day of Judgment (2 P 2⁴, Jude 6, 1 Enoch). These interpretations are even more strained than the first mentioned, and it makes against the latter that Jewish tradition regarded the lot of the fallen angels as hopeless. It is not unjust to say that they were all ruled by a more or less

dogmatic motive, namely, that the interpretation should conform to the interpreter's views of the nature of life beyond the grave, and more especially of the impossibility of enlightenment or pardon there.

The most thorough and comprehensive discussion of the two Petrine passages which has yet appeared is that of Dr. Karl Gschwind, which fills more than a hundred and thirty pages of his *Die Niederfahrt Christi in die Unterwelt* (1911), and we are indebted to Canon MACCULLOCH for a summary of Gschwind's interpretation, which also excludes any reference to a Descent to Hades, and, as far as 3^{18f.} is concerned, presents an entirely new and striking meaning. He takes the words ἐν ψ̄ in 3¹⁹ as meaning 'whereby,' 'wherewith,' and as referring not to 'the spirit' but to the whole preceding idea of Christ, who did good, and suffered even to death, but was glorified in His resurrection and ascension. This—the righteous suffering Christ thus glorified—is the subject of the announcement (ἐκήρυξεν), not necessarily a preaching by word, but an object-lesson. But an object-lesson to whom? The answer is in line with the third interpretation above-noted. To the disobedient angels and demons of the Flood-era, who are punished in the firmament or in one of the Heavens (as in 1 Enoch and elsewhere). As Christ incarnate, not pre-existent, ascends through the Heavens, the evil angelic and demoniac powers are shown the value of suffering for righteousness and made to recognize His glory who will be their future Judge. It is a novel exegesis, though it may possibly have the support of Irenæus; and we agree with Dr. MACCULLOCH that 'it introduces a topic which is much more a foreign body in the Epistle than a reference to the Descent to Hades would be.'

The interpretations of 4⁶ (the second Petrine passage) which avoid here a Preaching in Hades are mainly two. The first understands the νεκροί as those now dead, but to whom the gospel has been preached while they were in life; the second as those 'dead in trespasses and sins,' i.e. those who are or were spiritually dead, or simply the Gentiles—an interpretation favoured by St. Augustine,

and to which Gschwind's interpretation is somewhat analogous. Those who were spiritually dead, says Gschwind, learned the gospel when it was preached unto them: they now live according to God, *i.e.* spiritually, though men judge them wrongly. But Dr. MACCULLOCH holds that here again the literal interpretation gives the true sense: 'The preaching here spoken of is a preaching in Hades, a general preaching, not to one generation, of which a particular instance—to the disobedient of Noah's time—has already been given in 3¹⁹. Nothing was said there as to the purpose of the Preaching: that is now clearly stated here—that the dead, though

judged, may live to God.' It is added that, though St. Peter refers here to the purpose of the Preaching, he says nothing of its results. He does not teach a doctrine of a Harrowing of Hades. On the other hand, he is not writing a full account of the subject.

For the rest, whether the Petrine passages refer to the Descent or not, the doctrine itself, wherever derived (and Canon MACCULLOCH is opposed to the theory of pagan derivation), soon became very prominent in early Christian thought, as witness its place in the so-called Apostles' Creed.

Moral Problems of To-day.

IX.

Wealth.

BY PRINCIPAL W. F. LOFTHOUSE, D.D., HANDSWORTH.

THERE can be no doubt that in the minds of most thinking people the main issues of life to-day are economic. This is certainly true of politics. The discussions at the last Imperial Conference frankly looked upon the British Commonwealth of Nations as a union of vast trading concerns; the relations between the various European Powers are all of them deeply affected by tariff questions, even when they do not actually hinge upon them. 'Give us universal Free Trade, and there would be no more war.' No one seriously doubts the truth of this axiom. The proceedings of the League of Nations show the same dominant interest. Reviews of the past year at Geneva have observed that purely economic questions have taken up more and more time; and even when statesmen are dealing with the thorny problems of race and racial minorities, money enters into every problem; this is clear enough to watchful eyes at the Round Table Conference.

The phenomenon is not indeed a purely modern one. It is probably true that no war has been fought in the last three centuries in which one or other of the combatants has not felt that financial questions were really supreme, or which would have been fought at all apart from them. It may

even be said that the controlling power of money is the dominating problem for statesmen at the present time; for while the irresponsible use of political power itself has grown very difficult if not impossible in our day, the power of wealth in every department of life has been subjected to no such control, and is not improbably threatening to become an international and world-wide influence such as no empire has ever been.

Quite apart from all this, the question of wealth has a special importance for the Christian Church, and more particularly for the minister. The most serious attack ever made on organized religion as such started with Karl Marx's *Capital*. The real significance of life, urged that work (which was a philosophy as much as a system of economics), is economic and material, not spiritual or religious. Religion is but a drug which has been administered to stupefy the workers of the world, and prevent them from seeing where their real interest lies. For two generations this doctrine has been separating industry from the Church in Germany, and in the last twelve years its effects in Russia have startled and horrified the world.

But even if Marx had never written a line, and Russia were still living beneath the iron hand of

Czarism, the responsibility of the Church would be unchanged. For the Church must lead in the world in which it finds itself; and if that world is predominantly economic, it must master the economic issues of the time. The Church also has another interest in the matter. It is the guide and teacher of individuals as well as of society (the antithesis is one that must be used with caution), and there is no one influence that affects personal character and conduct and outlook more powerfully than money.

This is not simply to say that the Church has a special mission to the rich; rich and poor alike, and still more the great masses of the middle class, who form the largest part of the Churches' bodies of adherents, are limited, hampered, swayed, cast down, and inspired in a hundred ways by the smiles and frowns of that most capricious and tormenting mistress. It is still common for conscientious pastors to recognize that the subject must sometimes be dealt with in a ministry that hopes to be comprehensive; but the occasions for it come rarely. They forget that the subject is really staring at them in every book and almost on every page of the Bible; and if the issues there are not the issues of wealth and poverty but of life and death, they are fought out on a field every foot of which has been trodden by combatants who have idolized or dreaded this world's goods. 'Preachers would have done well,' it has been said, 'if they had been accustomed to give us a little less of theology from their pulpits, a little more of the Christian use of money.' If they had done so, they might have found themselves breaking new ground—always a rather troublesome proceeding—but they would not have been unfaithful to the duty of preserving the proportion of faith.

But it is time that we defined our subject more carefully. We have spoken of money and wealth as if they were the same thing. They are not; and if we are to find any new or useful light on our theme, it is the difference between them that will lead the way to it. 'Wealth' (we are quoting from Professor Edwin Cannan) 'means a particular state or condition of human beings'; 'it is compounded of satisfactions or dissatisfactions; but these are by no means exclusively economic; there are plenty of them which no one in his ordinary senses and with any regard to the ordinary uses of language would call economic.' 'There is no hard-and-fast line between economic and un-economic things; but for the meaning of the term economic we must fall back on "having to do with material welfare."' No hard-and-fast line indeed;

and who shall say where material welfare ends and immaterial welfare begins? We know a good deal more clearly than when Professor Cannan wrote these words, just before the outbreak of the Great War, how closely the material, the mental, and the moral condition one another; how a child, ill-fed, ill-housed, and ill-tended, is soon ripe for delinquency and the police court; and how, under the pressure of physical want or disaster, the morals of a whole society may be loosened.

But taking wealth in this narrower sense (without forgetting that there is a wider one) we observe that Cannan goes on to point out that a man's wealth will depend on the magnitude of his original powers in proportion to his physical requirements; the degree to which he has improved his powers and his outward surroundings; the good use of the judgment with which he uses his powers and surroundings; and the extent to which he has sacrificed the present for the future. If instead of 'a man' we say 'society,' the thing becomes even truer. That is, the conditions for wealth are found in character. If we would help men to wealth, we must help them to character. To quote Bishop Gore, 'property' (a form of wealth) 'is relative to character. It is a means towards a good life, and a good life for all men.'

Exactly; character or life, a means to wealth or property; wealth or property, a means to character and the good life. Even in the physical world science is making it impossible to distinguish between means and ends, causes and effects. But to pass from means to ends (however we arrange them in relation to one another) necessitates (let Professor Cannan proceed) 'that society is well organised—that it should have suitable machinery for securing that the original powers of the people shall be great.' This was once regarded as anathema; 'leave us,' said the gladiators in the commercial world, 'to ourselves. Private gain is public welfare. The state should merely keep the ring.' This was too readily believed in the Church; was it not a reason for keeping off the thorniest questions? But 'there never was and never can be a State which practises *laissez-faire*. The very establishment of a State negatives a policy of complete "let me alone." . . . There was really a large amount of State interference even in periods when the State seemed to do nothing except reinforce the people's respect for custom.' And this, though of course Professor Cannan does not go on to point it out, means that the Church can have no excuse for saying 'things must take their course; let us confine ourselves to thinking about the soul.'

Modern science and modern industry mean co-operation, on an ever-increasing and now quite portentous scale. Yet we "cannot live and work together in comradeship. We are masters of nearly everything but ourselves." So says Mr. Malcolm Sparkes, himself a leader in industry who has also held firm to his allegiance to the gospel. *Laissez-faire* still lives as a working scheme of individual conduct. "Why should others interfere with me in the use of what is my own?" It was manufactured by our great-grandfathers. "If they acted mistakenly, it was no fault of theirs, for they had no experience to guide them;" but if we fail to profit by theirs, and our own——? "The ideal for industry," he says, "would be the ideal, the family ideal, in the society contemplated by Jesus; the 'team spirit.'" To develop this would unite for a great constructive purpose the very forces now wasting their energies in (mutual) opposition. The team spirit is 'the great peacemaker in industry.'

We have quoted these words because they do not really embody a discovery on the part of Mr. Sparkes. They carry us back to the New Testament itself, its doctrine and its practice. "How hardly shall a rich man enter into the kingdom of heaven." 'The love of money is the root of all kinds of evil.' Why? Because it hardens a man's heart, closes his eyes and ears, and turns his mind inwards. It is the complete opposite of that negation of oneself through which alone we can hope to be confessed by Christ. No sooner had the infant Church come into being than its members set themselves light-heartedly to share all they had with one another. No authority commanded this, though authority might smile upon it. It was spontaneous. And when it speedily grew impracticable, it was replaced by other and more serviceable forms of 'pooling.' The Christian has other and better things to share than money. But he will do little sharing of that kind if he leaves his money out of his calculations. The New Testament lays quite remarkable stress on industry, diligence, fellow-feeling, and sympathy; but one of the dearest projects in Paul's long ministry was the collection which he organized from his mission churches for the benefit of the poor Jews in Palestine.

These New Testament aims may be thus brought up to date: 'to make things that are good in themselves; to make them plentifully and get them distributed widely; to eliminate all types of work and all systems of pay that have a bad effect on character; to improve the conditions of all engaged

in labour that is at present ill-guarded, insecure, or ill-paid.' This sketch does not mention money; and it sounds simple and obvious; but it involves difficulties that will often prove enormous; and without the habit of regarding the actual money we possess as not our own but to be used for the sake of Christ they will be insuperable. The "inherent sacredness of the breeches pocket," as Professor Hobbhouse calls it, warns off all attempts at industrial betterment as from holy ground.

There is no need to quote the direct warnings against the misuse of money in the New Testament. Every one can make a list of them for himself, and most will be surprised to find how long the list becomes. But it is worth while to recall the words of later authoritative teachers. For instance, to quote the early manual of conduct and ritual, the *Didache*, written less than a century after the death of Christ, 'thou shalt not turn away from him that is in want, and shalt not say of anything that it is thine own.' 'Thou, then, who hast received the gift of God' (it is Ambrose of Milan who asks the question), 'thinkest thou that thou committest no injustice by keeping to thyself alone what would be the means of life to many? . . . It is the bread of the hungry thou keepest; the money thou buryest is the redemption of the wretched.' An eleventh-century writer put it, 'rich men are stewards rather than owners.' 'A man who keeps for himself more than he needs is taking what belongs to another.'

Still more striking is the teaching of Aquinas, the 'angelic doctor,' as the Roman Church has always called him. Aquinas had a mind far too subtle to be content with the simple maxims of the early Church fathers; and he lived at a time when the largest owner of property was the Church itself. But he insisted on drawing a distinction between property and ownership; the former is the right of distribution, the latter the right of the use of one's possessions for one's own purposes. But if there is evident or urgent need (as Dr. Carlyle sums up the doctrine), it is even allowed that 'a man may legitimately take either openly or by stealth what he needs, and it is even legitimate in such cases that one man should take another man's property to help him that is in want.' It is no wonder that Tawney has remarked, 'the true descendant of the doctrine of Aquinas is the Labour Theory of Value. The last of the Schoolmen was Karl Marx.'

These few quotations may be taken as typical. Their substance was repeated through twelve centuries; nor was the opposite (so natural to our modern business mind) ever maintained by ecclesi-

astical authority. When we come to the Reformation, we are on more difficult ground; for on the one hand, the discoveries and developments of the end of the Middle Ages were giving birth to finance as we understand it to-day, but as it was never dreamt of in the ages of faith; and on the other, the reformers wished to compare as severe rather than as lax with their Catholic rivals. Thus, as Tawney has urged, 'the practical conception to which the premises of Luther led was a theory of society more medieval than that held by many thinkers in the Middle Ages, since it dismissed the commercial developments in the last two centuries as a relapse into paganism.'

But Luther had to look to the German princes for his support, and did not dare, nor wish, to criticise their politics or their finance too sharply. Calvin found himself building a great commercial State, or, rather, constructing a great social and religious idea of which commercial activity and vigour formed an essential part. The newly roused ideals and activities of Protestantism, prevented from finding full scope in government or the professions, found their vent in commerce as in a sacred calling. To such men, poverty was not a need to be relieved, or a reminder of the presence of Jesus in their midst in the least of His brethren; it was a symptom of idleness, a sign of sin which called for punishment rather than tenderness. Cromwell indeed could write, 'Be pleased to reform the abuses of all professions; and if there be any one that makes many poor to make a few rich, that suits not a commonwealth.' But with the growth of Protestantism came the common-sense philosophy, and, later on, with the coming of the factories, the 'dismal science.' Locke and his age would have none of the patristic view of property, as simply conditioned by common use and individual ownership; it was to them an institution of natural law, and arose out of labour. And so we come back to the cash nexus between employer and workman, and the doctrine of *laissez-faire*.

Well, what is to be done? Is the Church of to-day to echo the Church of the Middle Ages, or of the New Testament times? That is impossible, for two reasons. First, until quite recently poverty meant a condition that verged on destitution; it was the want of the elementary necessities of food and clothing and house-room; of commodities, that is, which could be transferred with the greatest ease from those who had them to those who had them not. Secondly, there was no mechanism, either in antiquity or in the Middle Ages, for the supply of individual wants by society. Private

benefactions of course there were; encouraged vigorously by the Church—at times the Church was not averse to appropriating them for her own sacred uses; but it was not till the age of Elizabeth, and then only in this island, that the State thought of saying, 'what private charity has hitherto accomplished for a few, I will henceforth accomplish for all.' Liberality is no longer at home in the categories of the Old Testament, or even of the New. To-day, we must remember that God loveth a cheerful rate-payer.

Wealth must aim at well-being, and well-being is personal. We must return from the individualism which is still with us—getting on, doing what I like with my own, making as much as I can in these hard times—to individuals; from socialism—however interpreted—to society. The call of the present age is for the vindication of persons. Our most serious foe at present, in this country, in spite of the vast mass of unemployment, is not poverty. The poor indeed are still with us; but there are a hundred ways of alleviating their worst burdens, unknown to our grandfathers. What we have to fear, now that the worst of economic poverty has come to an end, is that we should settle down to a new kind of poverty of spirit. Science has brought so many opportunities for cheap amusement within our reach, that life is altogether changed from the domination of the old dull fear of destitution that enslaved so many in the past. Life still has its miseries—miseries for which personal sympathy and friendship (so rare in the world even yet) are the true cure. But for thousands and even millions of people it is coming to mean a struggle for pleasure (cheap or expensive) when the hours of work are over, mixed with envy, suspicion, or hatred, of those whose wages, or profits, lessen the sum available for our own desires. Here lies the modern task of wealth.

Wealth does not mean the possession of money, ample or moderate. It means the possession of gifts which make life worth living; gifts, indeed, that, once possessed, cannot be given away. But they can be shared; and even sharing will generally imply the transference of some amount of money. The goal of the Church of Christ in this matter must be 'joy in widest commonality spread.' The Church has not lost her influence yet—as she would find, if she would set herself to use it. Society can still be transformed. Ideals of life can be lifted. Envy, hatred and malice can be driven out. Callousness can be banished. What is needed is a new sense of responsibility. We are stewards; that is a commonplace. But it is more

than a commonplace if we reflect that the last judgment will be a last audit ; that for every sixpence we spend, and for every avenue of enjoyment open to us, we shall be held responsible. In this sense it is true that everything we keep to ourselves we withhold from others ; in the blunt language of the early fathers, we are thieves.

What have we that we did not receive ? Why did we receive it but that we might impart it to our neighbours ? It is for the preacher to enforce a new standard of life, of giving, of commercial and social altruism or fellowship, the habit of mind that looks on possessions, assets, talents, as endow-

ments. The conviction born of such an interpretation of Christianity will bear fruit a hundred-fold. How much has been done in this direction by even a few men of high character and large generosity ! But all that is suggested to some by the name of Cadbury, and to others, perhaps, by the name of Josiah Stamp, would be impossible without the diffused Christian sentiment of numbers of humbler people. True wealth can only be gathered, and preserved, by those who have learnt the Divine art of scattering. It may be that in these difficult times, wealth may yet be gained, and imparted, beyond the dreams of avarice.

The Task of a Theological College.¹

BY PRINCIPAL W. M. MACGREGOR, D.D., TRINITY COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

ON this day of new beginnings I propose to speak of the essential task of a Theological College, for, in any effective sense, this would seem to have been very variously conceived. In a loose fashion, it is understood by every one that our business is to prepare men for the Christian ministry, but people set about this task in such diverse ways as, at least, to suggest some difference in fundamental conception. Some teachers seem to be content to produce the successful examinee—the creature who can endure ordeals and secure good degrees ; others, rather disdainful of the mere examinee, seek to stimulate independent thought, and to kindle and to fan the sacred fire of the love of truth—scientific, philosophical, ultimate ; but some humbly take it as their principal object to fashion and enlarge men, more eager to see humanity enriched in them than to see perfection in verbal or technical scholarship. The methods do not absolutely exclude one another, and yet the difference in stress at this point or that is almost bound to appear in some material difference in the output.

1. The first and easiest of these, both for teacher and student, is the plain, schoolmaster's plan. A teacher of Divinity may secure for his men a certain bowing acquaintance with theories and words, so that in their future reading these may be recognized ; he gives them careful summaries of the

characteristic positions of Augustine and Anselm and Abelard, of Calvin and Arminius, of Schleiermacher and Ritschl and Macleod Campbell, so that in their minds these teachers may have labels attached to them, indicating where each stands. An attentive student thus acquires what may be very serviceable—a sort of historical chart recording the movements of opinion ; but unfortunately not all students are attentive, and a host of them read and memorize the labels, and, as soon as the examination is over, cast the subject into the lumber-room of memory, where moth and rust do corrupt. For a week, or even for a month or two, they may attain to some knowledge of what a great master thought, but scarcely of why he thus thought, or of how his thought is related to the truth of the matter, or to the working theories of men to-day. The teaching is purely objective and factual. Even a good student thus trained is exercised in memory more than in understanding, so that what he does acquire remains essentially as foreign matter in his mind, a body of unassimilated facts and notes out of the history of human opinion. Emerson declares it 'essential for a theologian not to allow himself to be excluded from any Church.' He may or may not agree with the distinctive doctrines of a particular Church, but he ought to discern what in religion that Church is aiming at, and how even its errors are intelligible. But if a true theologian is not excluded from any Church the products of this kind of training never find entrance *into* any. Each doctrinal or liturgical type in turn is ticketed as

¹ An Inaugural Address delivered October 13, 1930, at the beginning of joint teaching and classes between the Divinity Faculty in Glasgow University and Trinity College.

orthodox or heterodox, Greek or Latin or Reformed, and no unifying religious sympathy comes in to bind them all together as so many unachieved endeavours after the mystery of God in Jesus Christ. There is no doubt that this pædagogic way is the easiest for the teacher, and it is vastly the least exacting for the student, but what is it worth for the ministry? What does it matter to the people whether a man has or has not in memory some vague idea of the positions held by Socinus or Amyraldus or Barth? They want to know what is true; they want news about God and the other world, and whether they have a part to play in it. That model administrator Gallio spoke for many Christians of to-day when he said: 'If it be a question of words and names and of your law (the orthodoxy of the particular Church objectively presented) look ye to it, for I will be no judge in such matters.'

2. The second rests on a far nobler conception, and, in some measure, it is found in all the great theologians, for to them the real subject of study has never been a mere succession of theories and opinions, but the unexhausted mysteries of God. They have often handled their theme in a way partisan and embittered—as Athanasians against Arius, Augustinians against Pelagius, Evangelicals against Rome. On their way to the goal they have had to take account of men who were seeking, as they thought, to mislead, and bitter words were spoken; but the goal itself was clear. Their one desire was to rest in nothing short of the Truth, in some fuller apprehension of the Divine Nature, and they sought to infect their disciples with the same clean ambition. To this task they brought monumental learning and unslackening study; by rigorous self-discipline they sought to secure that nature in them might be at its best, and then with prayer and mystical exaltation they laboured to reach beyond themselves and beyond human opinions to 'That which is.' The splendour of this conception irradiated the whole working out of it, though this may often now seem drearily scholastic; for even when fogs gather thick, shafts of Divine light strike through. 'Das Denken ist auch Gottesdienst,' as Hegel said—thinking is also a kind of worship. This sense of occupation with the Divine extended for them even to matters on the circumference. When discussing details in Textual Criticism, Bengel said: 'If He counts the hairs of my head, is it a small thing for me to concern myself with the fringes of His garment? Of a Jewish saint in Eastern Europe it was observed that as he laboured over the minutæ of the Law

his face glowed 'as if a lamp had been kindled within him.' The details might seem trivial, but then they were of God's appointing, and to be busied with them was to be busied with Him, so that study became sacramental. Hazlitt records about his father, an obscure Unitarian minister, that whilst in the books he read there was 'nothing to dazzle or to excite modern curiosity, yet to his lack-lustre eyes it was enough that in the unwieldy, neglected tomes there appeared the sacred name of Jehovah in Hebrew capitals. There were glimpses, glimmering notions of the patriarchal wanderings, with palm trees hovering on the horizon. Moses with the Burning Bush, and types and shadows—the great lapses of time, the strange mutations of the globe were all unfolded as the voluminous pages were turned over. My father's life was very much a dream, but it was a dream of infinity and eternity.' The splendour of God inspired such learned studies, for what engaged the student was not the vagaries of human opinion, but the ultimates of truth.

The same preoccupation with what is true is seen, in less exalted and romantic forms, in the modern conception of theology as science. A famous teacher in an American university is accustomed to impress on his students that theological investigation is subject to tests as austere as those in chemistry, and that, in the one as in the other, anything of the nature of bias, any wish for a particular result, must operate as a disqualification. If such a maxim were driven too hard it would readily topple over into absurdity, for a man who loves God, or who knows whom he has believed, might be held disqualified even for investigating the nature of God. The maxim is paradoxical, and yet there is a certain grandeur in the austerity of such an attitude. Pride must be humbled, traditional and customary preferences must be set aside; there must be no wresting of Scripture to one's own edification or to the support of one's own opinion, for it is truth we are after. Our concern is with the naked fact of things; and here supremely we are taught that humility and openness of mind are the prime intellectual qualifications of a theologian.

But at this point objections rise from more than one quarter. For one thing, there is a psychological question: is the truth about God which we seek to make our own to be attained by just these scientific instruments? Our Lord Jesus and His servant Paul, like Plato before them, were clear that the highest ranges of knowledge are not to be reached by merely logical process. There are 'things hidden from the wise and the clever, said Jesus, and revealed to babes.' When Paul writes

of the amazing commonplaces of God's mercy he borrows a phrase from Isaiah, but gives it a significant twist: the prophet had spoken of unimagined things as assured to 'those who *wait for God*,' but the apostle alters this to 'those who *love God*.' For in Paul's view, love is like another nobler sense, and those who are without it may miss what is clearly outspread before them. 'The heart,' as Pascal says, 'has reasons of which mere reasoning knows nothing.' Thus in these higher ranges an approach too narrowly intellectual may defeat itself, and the wise and the clever be left outside. But in view of the purpose of our ministry there is another very real objection. Too resolute an indulgence of intellectualism, even in the pursuit of Divine truth, tends to produce a certain spiritual isolation, cutting men off from their fellows and from the activities and purposes of life. Even on a humbler level many students of to-day in their later university terms profess that they grow stale and lose interest, because even if they mastered all that is set before them what the better would they be for life, with its manifold calls to help their fellows? Hazlitt complains that 'learning is the knowledge of that which none but the learned know.' A man, as he says, may be able to translate a word into ten different languages, and not know what the *thing* denotes in any language; and yet it is this which people, engrossed in the task of living, wish to know. It is possible for any one in his eagerness for scientific truth to become like a tortoise, so securely enclosed in the armour of his special learning as scarcely to touch the common life of men at all. Through holes for his feet that he may walk and his head that he may eat he 'leaks out on to the exterior world,' as Samuel Butler says, but otherwise he remains secluded and apart. The truth which he attains is scarcely what Wordsworth calls 'truth fit to be communicated.' And, unfortunately, there are theologians and even ministers of this kind, resolute in their love for truth, but essentially outsiders as regards the life and the needs of men.

3. But now we come to a conception of our task ampler and more inclusive than either of those we have considered. Our business, as every one at least in word agrees, is to train men for the ministry, which means that we train them so that, by preaching and by life, they may make God known to their fellows. But this cannot be achieved merely by furnishing them with a store of more or less relevant information, it cannot even be achieved by inflaming them with love for abstract truth; for when either or both of these is accomplished, what about the

people to whom they are to minister, with their great, gaping needs and their slow minds, with their rushes of appetite and their poisoned and embittered suspicions? Has anything substantial been done to make the teaching bear upon that life? Dr. Chalmers's ever-urgent precept was to get 'the theology of the Chair transmuted into the theology of the pulpit.' There is always a danger, as it seems to me and as the experience of Germany and Holland suggests, when men are appointed to Divinity chairs who have been students but never evangelists. 'The great danger in our own country,' says Principal Selbie, 'is that there should be a divorce between theology and personal religion. We must keep the two together. We must realize that in dealing with theology we are dealing with what affects man as well as God.'

I would not have you summarily dismiss either of the conceptions of which I have spoken. A detailed knowledge of the history of the movements of opinion is indispensable as a guide in theological thought; it gives us a kind of mental chart. Without this a man may plume himself on his own originality, when he is simply reviving opinions which were commonplaces to Origen or Aquinas. And still more indispensable for our work is the sacred thirst for truth—for the thing as it is. This belongs to our worship and reverence of God, and it is a supremely wholesome discipline of our temper as teachers and students. We need to realize that things will be as they will be and not as we should like to have them, that Scripture has a meaning and is not to be twisted or diluted to suit our opinions or our sentiment. We need to unlearn our predilections and to grasp the fact that it does not matter what we may think or prefer, since it is truth and the fact of things we are after. This humbling discipline must attend us in every part of our theological training, for God is always greater than any thoughts we have formed of Him, and reverently we must follow on to know the Lord. But this need not withdraw us from the life and the needs of men. 'Deep theology is the best fuel for devotion,' says Faber, for once it catches fire it burns long. To make God great to men—that is the soul of any preaching or any worship that is worth considering. Of Ebenezer Erskine it was said by a contemporary that a man who had not heard him preach had not 'heard the Gospel in its majesty,' and this quality of the preaching was the outcome not merely of a great nature deeply moved, but of profound and spacious thoughts of God. The deep theology found expression through a man, and thus to the multitude it came with power; but

to provide for the first and to leave the second out of account would be to break off our work when it is less than half done. The man can never be taken for granted. 'To teach religion,' says Carlyle, 'the first thing needful and the last, and indeed the only thing, is to find a man who *has* religion. All else follows from this—Church building, Church extension, and whatever else is needful follows; but without this nothing will follow.' In comparison with the question of the man any consideration of orders is insignificant. A priesthood, when challenged to declare what it can do for men, may protest that it is of God and invested with authority; but such protestations do not deserve a hearing. It is the man that counts and not the office: 'cucullus non facit monachum'—the cowl does not make the monk. As he stands to communicate the life that is in him he must on the one side be continually open to the fresh revelations and discoveries of a God who is never completely silent, but on the other side he must ever be open to the appeals of men—their ignorance and obstructions and blunderings, and their fierce assaults of trouble; and in everything he must consider how the two may be brought together. This means that as he must be a man of God so he must also be a man among men, touched with the feeling of their infirmities. A great teacher of the Secession Church—Dr. Lawson of Selkirk—claimed that there are three main necessities for a Divinity student: that he be a true Christian, that he store up knowledge which he can afterwards communicate, and that he acquire a faculty for communicating it. This last does not mean acquiring a budget of elocutionary or rhetorical tricks, for the fewer of these you have the better for your real ministry, since it is the man that counts and not his tricks; and there is scarcely a limit to what a man can be and do to his fellows, if only he be a whole man. Seneca stands as a world-renowned moralist, but Emerson says grimly of him what applies to many sermons: 'His thoughts are excellent, if only he had the right to utter them.' A preacher cannot always count on reason and nobleness in those who listen to him, and therefore he must be prepared

to give them of his own reason and nobleness; but how if he has none but only a few pulpit dexterities? A brilliant German woman said of Goethe: 'Other men I love with my own strength, but he teaches me to love with his strength': for in contact with him she felt herself carried out into a world of richer powers and enthusiasms, where the familiar restricted world was left behind her.

Since, then, the equipping of the man is so vital, our work in all its departments must have this in view. Dogmatic is not to be handled as an abstract science, for its main theme is the nature and the life of a God who reveals Himself, and whom to know is life and life that lasts. The theology of the Chair ought to be such as can readily be transmuted into the theology of the pulpit. In Church History it is notable how Harnack, in a piece of research like his *Expansion of Christianity*, gave us one of the most impressive as well as instructive missionary books of our time; learning there joined hands with life. Lindsay's masterly book on *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries* was largely the outcome of his missionary tour in India, and his volume on the German Reformation is, in many of its sections, directly a book for the soul. We whose business it is to teach the Old and the New Testaments have, in many ways, an easier task, if we do not lose ourselves in verbal subtleties, for we deal with a literature which everywhere is throbbing with human life. 'My impression is,' said A. B. Davidson, 'that literature is the most profitable study for the preacher; for in it the human mind in all its breadth, its emotions, its aspirations, its idealism, its griefs and cries over failure—in a word, its humanity—is best to be seen.' That was spoken of literature in general, but it is certainly not less true of this Divine literature which tells of men's discoveries of God, and of how He sought and found them. At the centre of all our life must be prayer and the sense of dedication to a high adventure, and in this you students of the college can help one another, and thus do something to make our association here a living fellowship of faith and service in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Literature.

INDIAN THOUGHT: THE UNIQUENESS OF CHRISTIANITY.

INDIA holds men's eyes and thoughts these days, and here comes a group of books on India well worth our study. Perhaps the one with the most wide and immediate appeal is *Mahatma Gandhi: His Own Story* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net). It is an abridgment of the three volumes in which Gandhi has given to the world the strange and romantic story of his life and soul. Abridgments are never wholly satisfactory. But the Editor, that close and tried friend of his hero, Mr. C. F. Andrews, has done his part with affection and skill. This is a wholly honest record, as one would expect from Gandhi, hiding nothing, minimizing nothing, which will affect different minds in different ways. To one reader it has proved, upon the whole, a little disillusioning. Certainly that a notable saint should have been fashioned out of the really sorry stuff of Gandhi's original nature is a remarkable proof of what Divine grace and a man's own whole-heartedness can do. For sorry stuff it was. As photographed here, Gandhi the boy was a repulsive little creature, shy and frightened, running home to avoid the other lads, playing no games, lying and pilfering, indulging on the sly in practices which to his religion are monstrous sins, and to this unpleasant boy when thirteen, there was handed over a girl of a like age as wife. What followed was deplorable, and the restrained and yet heart-broken record of 'his double shame' as he expresses it, is as terrible a picture of the horrors of child marriage and its positive beastliness and carnality as one need read. And out of that cruel, self-indulgent little bully has evolved this man whose hold upon the masses of the East is very largely due to their avid reverence for his obvious saintliness. The man stands out with vividness. And much in him stirs the imagination—his dauntless courage, his electrifying capacity for leadership in the long struggle in South Africa and in his own homeland, his quiet eagerness of sacrifice for what he feels to be great ends, the spiritual hunger in him to possess the highest that he sees, to have it all, at any cost, however heavy, making one feel ashamed of one's own miserable tepidity—and many virtues more.

Yet there are other elements in him that jar—a legalism of mind that seems sometimes almost childish; a lack of humour, that fatal want—

witness the preposterous and pompous letter to a good lady who was trying to make things more homelike for him when an alien in England, in which he solemnly assumes she is angling for him for one of her girl friends, a letter over which the good soul wrote in answer that they had had 'a hearty laugh,' and little wonder. Or take his ignorance of literature, which, with the ignorant man's confidence, he asserts has lost him little, though palpably it left him at the mercy of certain chance books that did happen to come his way, like Ruskin's 'Unto This Last,' or some of Tolstoy. Or that odd sense in a proudly humble, or a terribly proud, way of his own importance, which is not always pleasing. His wife must not have beef-tea, although she may die for lack of it. But he can make his vow, and take goat's milk (though with a conscience still uneasy over it unto this day); for, you see, he is he, and too important to let perish. And above all there is the oddest absence of balance in his mind and nature. Witness those quite pitiful domestic squabbles, verging on violence, with his wife that have occurred; though on the next page we are told of fasts endured in sorrow for his people's sins, as later for those of his followers in India. All this and much more in him brings home to one's mind the problems of our countrymen to whom he is opposed, makes plain that he must be a very difficult person with whom to deal, except as a disciple.

His relations with Christianity, in fact, have not been altogether happy. He has not always seen it at its best, or even at its normal. And he talks of it here with less friendliness than one had been led to expect.

And yet, glorious creature of God though he may be—it is again and again just that touch Christ would have given that one misses. Most of us Christians he may in many ways leave far behind. But in the matter of the living out of life, between him and the Master is a great gulf fixed. Before that standard even he looks small.

Gandhi once set himself to read the Bible, with very ill results. He began it in Genesis, and could not keep awake before he had gone very far. But the sacred scriptures of his own land fascinate and thrill his very soul. The Gita, he thinks, is 'the supreme book of the knowledge of Truth,' but 'To-day,' as indeed he has always done, 'I regard the Ramayana of Tulsidas as the greatest book in all devotional literature.'

That has not been a very easy work for Westerners to know, huge place although it holds in India, being the cherished Bible of a hundred millions of our fellow-subjects. Growse's excellent translation is not too easily procurable, though others, Dutt in *Everyman*, for instance, have done something to help us. But to some real extent the blank has now been filled by an excellent book, *The Ramayan of Tulsidas*, by Mr. J. M. Macfie, M.A., Ph.D. (T. & T. Clark; 8s. net).

Dr. Macfie has other helpful works to his credit, such as 'The Myths and Legends of India' and the 'Ramayana of Vālmiki,' which have brought some of the lore of that old land within our reach. But this last book of his is as useful as any of them, if not more so. The work with which he deals is so important in the spiritual history of his race; its author, Tulsidas, is so remarkable a figure; the story that he tells is so characteristically Indian—like much of Indian art, of the uncouth and grotesquely exaggerated, like much of Indian religion, often a wild chaotic jumble of conflicting elements, impossible for a Western mind to hold together or to piece into a whole, yet like much of the Indian spiritual classics, often deeply moving in its reading of life and of morality, and of the way to win through to the real goal of being. For Tulsidas, born in the sixteenth century, is of course one of the leaders of the Bhakti school, which, recoiling from the coldness of the monistic creed it found, proclaims that not by knowledge, but by love and devotion to a God adored, is it that one can soonest rise to what one ought to be; and that in God there must be, and there is, a grace that comes, at huge cost to itself, to the salvation of those able to do nothing for themselves.

This is not a translation; but a swift summary of Rama's Deeds is given, followed by detailed and right suggestive studies that lead one very near the heart of Hinduism in some of its forms, and then a final chapter on the influence of the work upon Indian thought. A scholarly and effective bit of work.

And what is this Bhakti religion? For a worthy answer to that question we have *India's Religion of Grace and Christianity Compared and Contrasted*, a masterly little book of much more importance than its size betokens, by Professor Rudolf Otto (S.C.M.; 6s. net).

The distinguished author of 'The Idea of the Holy' is, of course, an expert in this field, with other notable works—'West-Östliche Mystik,' and 'Vishnu Nārāyana'—to his credit; and his treat-

ment of his theme has all the first-hand knowledge of a true and impressive scholar, and, what is much less common, a balance, and a sanity, and a steady step where other enthusiasts are apt to stagger drunkenly into the one extreme or else the other.

Hinduism is so protean a thing that one can believe almost anything, and still be an orthodox Hindu. Even in the same mind doctrines which clash noisily in European ears can be held together without any jarring or discomfort. But there are, of course, two main types—the intellectual monism of Sankara and such-like, and the passionate devotion to a personal god, taught India by Ramayana and like-minded souls before and since, which latter is tolerated by the other as well enough for the dull herd still lost in the mists of *maya* and illusion, but of little absolute worth for those farther on. None the less, there are those in India who claim it as the one and only way to redemption and salvation, and this on grounds that, as Otto puts it, 'dumbfounds the Protestant' because of its strikingly analogous contentions to his own on the deep and central things, which 'in the most remarkable way, might appear like a double of our own special Protestant problems of grace.' Here, too, are 'lost' things who have 'fallen,' crying for 'salvation and redemption,' who have learned that the toll of 'good works' is quite inadequate, that what we need is 'grace,' and a God Incarnate, and that that grace is offered freely; and who, turning from philosophical speculation, and from mystical experiences running out into the loss of personality, believe in Bhakti, *i.e.* in 'surrender in simple trusting appropriation of the grace of the Lord, and in love to Him.'

And the question is, 'Have we here a competitor of Christianity, and that at the most fundamentally Christian points?' There are those in India who answer Yes; and are preparing to send out missionaries to teach us Westerners salvation. But Otto, while whole-hearted in admiration of this other faith, and eager to underline the amazing similarities, believes in the uniqueness of Christianity. Striking as are all the chapters, the last, in which the differences are made to leap out of patterns that had seemed almost the same to a casual glance, is the most scholarly and remarkable. The Lord's Prayer, he shows, won't pray in India. At a recent Congress of Religions it was rejected as 'a Christian prayer, but not at all an Indian prayer, or a universal prayer which a convinced native of India might adopt without hesitation.' And he proceeds to show how different is the axis upon which Christianity turns from that of this other

faith, similar though it seems. The agreements are striking and bewildering. But the centre of the two is altogether different, so absolutely different, he feels, that he has no belief in such ideas as that the great Bhakti Books of India might for them replace the Old Testament in their Bibles, as for us the Hebrew prophets run up into their fulfilment of the Gospels. There is no such development, he says. From the religion of India to Christianity there is a *saltus*, 'not an evolutionary and gradual transition.' 'The religion of India turns upon an altogether different axis from the religion of the Bible, and cannot be regarded as preparation and fulfilment, or as the preparatory stage and the stage of completion.'

That is a striking judgment, filling in a hope along these very lines in many minds as the one way to win touchy and patriotic India to the faith. And there are two sides to the question. Yet Otto is not easily answerable in his list of the essential differences yawning underneath the wonderful resemblances. There is a different conception of God, he says. 'One would surmise an interpolation' if one came in an Indian classic on 'Our Father which art in heaven.' There is 'lacking in India the idea, without which Christianity is no Christianity,' that the Kingdom of God will come. Here is no question of a 'mere displacement of axis, but a central idea that is contrary to the type of piety to be found in India.' On the world, on our relations to our fellow-men, on the nobility of work, the cleavage is unbridgeable. 'Social and cultural ethics is necessary to a developed Christianity, and Thomas Aquinas shaped it on a great scale. The theologians of the Bhakti religion never did think of these things, and never could by any impulse of their religion.' But 'the most profound difference of all' is what is meant 'by rescue of the lost,' yes, and of grace itself. The closely reasoned pages of discussion on those high themes are the best in the book, at once broad-minded and intellectually honest. 'The axis of the search for salvation in ancient India was, as it is given in the old prayer :

Lead me from *non-being* to *being*;
Lead me from darkness to the light;
Lead me from death to the super-death,

But the fundamental motive of the religion of Palestine is given in the ancient Word of Holy Writ :

Ye shall be *holy*, for I am *holy*.

There is far less depth and weight in the idea of

sin in India. Sanskrit has perhaps no full equivalent for 'sin,' 'repentance,' or 'confession'; and 'rebirth' means something 'quite different from the new birth of the Spirit.' 'A special predicate, and a term "holy" solely applicable to the Lord is not found even among the bhaktas.' And so Redemption also, in its essence, means another and a poorer thing. 'Christianity is the religion of the conscience *per substantiam*, bhakti religion that religion *per accidens*.' 'One does not know in his religion the curse of sin.' And most profound distinction of all, its forgiveness 'is an overlooking of the fault not of compassion for the suffering of the trouble which the faulty one has drawn down upon himself. It is *indulgentia*—not the Christian forgiveness with its far more profound and even mysterious sound.' It is 'not expiating grace to the sinner.' 'India has no expiator, no Golgotha, and no Cross.'

And so in a concluding word Otto declares that, while many are impressed by the similarities, he would welcome the day when the sense of the contrast between Christianity and the best of their own faith comes home to the East. For then, he thinks, things might begin to happen, but not sooner.

This is a moving book with much to feed the mind, and much to stir the soul.

JESUS.

Two books of very different character have been published, dealing with the Person of Jesus Christ. One is *Jesus—Lord or Leader?* by the Rev. Frank Lenwood (Constable; 7s. 6d. net). It is a book that makes rather sad reading. Mr. Lenwood was formerly a missionary in the East. He had been closely associated with the Student Christian Movement, and had had a very definite Christian experience. But these things are in the past. He is now minister of a Congregational Church in London whose members are dissatisfied with the ordinary orthodox presentation of Christianity. He has abandoned his belief in the Divinity of Christ. He has ceased to believe either in His infallibility or in His sinlessness. And he has written this book for those who are seeking the freedom which he has won for himself.

One desires to treat any sincere book with respect, and this is a sincere book. But it is none the less pathetic in this, that Mr. Lenwood imagines himself able to retain all that was essential in his former faith. As a matter of fact he can retain nothing with any basis of assurance. The argu-

ments he advances about the question of the trustworthiness of the Gospels do not leave (as he fancies) a human Jesus. They leave nothing at all. The Gospels know nothing of a naturalistic Jesus. His Divinity is in the warp and woof of the narratives. You cannot cut out what you dislike, and keep what you like. The gospel picture may be all wrong. If it is, we have no picture whatever. Moreover, we have no gospel to offer men. The one thing the New Testament stands for is that God has broken through to us in Christ. Mr. Lenwood is quite wrong when he says, 'What Christians have found in the worship of Jesus has all the time been a communion with God.' Christians have found far more than that. They have found God Himself. And if the gospel picture of Jesus, and the New Testament message about God that comes to us through that, are not valid, then we have really nothing worth saying about God.

Of course we learn something about God from Nature and history. But was there ever a gospel in that for sinning, burdened humanity? Unitarianism is not an inspiring creed. It is arid and sterile. And even Unitarianism is becoming doubtful in the eyes of the new psychology. The author looks back on his former experience and accounts for the form of it (the substance, he would say, was real) by psychology. But what guarantee has he that his present experience is not explicable in the same way?

We have spoken, without offence we trust, at least without intentional offence, of the pathos of this book. The abandonment of a faith that was once a joyous certainty is always a sad spectacle. But fully as pathetic is the author's concluding chapter on the need of a revival and his emphasis on the urgency of our getting back the joy and spring of the early Church. Does he really conceive it possible that joy or spring such as theirs could come from the fragments of truth that are left after his analysis?

The other book is *A Life of Jesus*, by the Rev. Basil Mathews (Milford; 7s. 6d. net). This 'life' is as traditional in its positions as the other is revolutionary. Its material is the harmonized gospel narratives plus an intimate knowledge of the Holy Land, its people and its life. Mr. Mathews' acquaintance with these is not that of a casual visitor. He has lived in Palestine for long periods, and has had access to first-hand experiences that constantly light up the story. Those who know that first-rate biography 'Paul the Dauntless' will be aware that Mr. Mathews can write a vivid story, and the same blessed gift is to be found in this new

volume. We must emphasize the amount of labour, care, and knowledge that are behind these easy-seeming pages. This is 'a work of many days,' long pondered, wrought out with toil and love. And the result is excellent. There are two beautiful colour pictures by Holman Hunt, and a large number of photographs taken by the author himself, and very good these are and very illuminating. This would be a fine gift for any senior boy or girl.

THE DESCENT TO HADES.

Much was written in ancient and mediæval times on the *descensus ad inferos*. It was natural that curiosity should be felt regarding the unrecorded period of Christ's life between death and resurrection, and from at least the second century that period was filled in by the doctrine of the Descent, including with rapidly growing detail the overcoming of Death and Hades, the Preaching to the Dead, and the Release of Souls. The classical treatment of the subject is in the apocryphal 'Gospel of Nicodemus.' In the Middle Ages it was often treated by poets, dramatists, and artists. A favourite title with Mediæval English writers was the 'Harrowing of Hell,' inasmuch as the thought bulking most largely in their minds was that of the spoliation of the Underworld by Christ.

In his new work, *The Harrowing of Hell* (T. & T. Clark; 12s. net), the Rev. Canon J. A. MacCulloch, D.D., reviews the sources of the doctrine of the Descent and traces its development in the early Church. At the same time he would substantiate the thesis that the belief owes little or nothing to pagan myths (e.g. Bousset holds that the original conception of the Descent was that of a fight between Christ and the Rulers of the Underworld, and that this was borrowed directly from mythical sources). But Canon MacCulloch is willing to admit that the form in which the belief is expressed is mythical, i.e. in accordance with current conceptions (in Jewish thought) of the Other World.

In maintaining his thesis Canon MacCulloch finds himself opposed to scholars, besides Bousset, like Pfeiderer and Gunkel; but on his side there is the authority of Clemen and Loofs. Clemen writes: 'The theory that Jesus preached in Hades was one so obvious, if earlier generations had lived without knowledge of the Gospel, that it could arise, in fact was bound to arise, even in the absence of any foreign prototype.' Loofs writes: 'Who can believe, without being otherwise convinced, that the Palestinian Christians of the Apostolic Age were acquainted with Orpheus going down to the

Underworld, with the Babylonian myth of Istar's descent to hell, or with Hibil-Ziwa, the divine visitor and vanquisher of hell in Mandeism ?

We commend Canon MacCulloch's valuable monograph to the attention of our readers. His name is a guarantee of scholarly care and competence. Indeed, there are few scholars among us so well qualified to undertake such a comparative study of doctrine as is here involved, or so capable of presenting the results of his investigations in clear and balanced form. The documentation of the work leaves nothing to be desired.

Though Canon MacCulloch admits that the belief in the Descent is expressed in mythical form, he sees in it an abiding value. He cannot regard it, with Dr. Percy Gardner, as 'mere dead wood from the tree of Christian doctrine,' nor can he agree with Loofs that the article *descendit ad inferos* should be omitted from the instruction of the Evangelical Churches. 'Men are coming to assume more and more that all God's dealings with them are of the nature of an educative process, that this process is continued in the Other World, and that, however painful to some souls it may be, it is in the end salutary, a process with an ethical and spiritual purpose.' And 'the doctrine of the Descent, the Preaching, and the Rescue of Souls is an ancient, and should be a permanent, symbol of this view.'

EARLY CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

We bespeak a warm and wide welcome for an excellent study of the social precept and practice of the ancient Church—*The New Commandment*, by the Rev. C. S. Phillips, D.D. (published for the Church Historical Society by the S.P.C.K.; 6s. net). At the very start Dr. Phillips reminds us that the gospel is a social gospel. 'Its aim is not simply to snatch individuals out of a corrupt and doomed world. Rather it seeks to refashion human society as a whole in conformity with the Divine purpose.' Of equal importance is his other reminder that it is easy, and has been too frequently done, to paint the moral state of the pre-Christian world in much too lurid colours. Yet he finds that between the *liberalitas* of the pagan and the *caritas* of the Christian there lay in nearly every case a profound difference in motive. *Liberalitas* is the munificence of the patron; *caritas* is the selfless tenderness of the saint. We find on every other page of this work striking and suggestive sentences which we should like to quote, but the very abundance of such admonishes us to refrain. It is a satisfying book, one of the most satisfying

that we have read for some time. It is in three sections dealing respectively with 'The Apostolic Age,' 'Before the Time of Constantine,' and 'Constantine and his Successors.'

THE CREEDS.

A new history of the Creeds in English has been a desideratum for some time past, and the Rev. F. J. Badcock, D.D., has undertaken the task in producing *The History of the Creeds* (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net). It is written primarily for theological students, whom the author addresses in a kindly preface giving them counsel as to how best they may study his work. Dr. Badcock is evidently well equipped for speaking with some authority on this subject, and this volume may be confidently used as containing all the facts available regarding the three great historic Creeds and tracing their growth from germ to final form. The author has his own views, which appear to ourselves very reasonable indeed, but he sets before us dispassionately other views as well. The work is the fruit of much labour and research. It sets out conveniently in parallel columns a great mass of forms of clauses of Creeds which will prove of immense benefit to the student. It is, in short, a most scholarly work for which all students of the history of the early Church will find great reason to be grateful.

THE BOOK OF EXODUS.

The Chief Rabbi has speedily followed up his excellent commentary on Genesis by a second volume of the *Pentateuch and Haphtorahs* (Milford; 7s. 6d. net), which covers the Book of Exodus with the 'Lessons from the Prophets,' and runs to six hundred and eleven pages. Few Biblical books tax the skill of a commentator more than the Book of Exodus, for it raises an unusual variety of problems—problems, for example, of the historical background, of credibility, of ritual, of miracle, etc. The writer has to face the question of the relation of the Book of the Covenant to the Code of Hammurabi, of the identity of the Pharaoh of the oppression and of the exodus, of the nature of the manna and the crossing of the Red Sea, of the date and the value of the Decalogue, and other questions equally perplexing. These are faced by Dr. Hertz in a conservative spirit, but with adequate knowledge of the position with which he disagrees, and always in a way that tends 'unto edification.' This is as it should be in a book designed 'for each worshipper in

every synagogue, for each child in every Jewish school, and for each member of every Jewish home.' The chief Rabbi believes that the Mosaic Civil Law is not dependent on the Code of Hammurabi: both are 'independent codifications of ancient Semitic Common Law.' The Pharaoh of the oppression he identifies with Rameses II. and the Pharaoh of the exodus with Menremptah. The manna is 'clearly a miraculous substance.' The Ten Commandments were 'spoken at Sinai'; of this he has no doubt. The strength of this commentary lies in its fine sympathetic exegesis, which, while it gathers up the best fruits of Jewish scholarship, draws gratefully from all sources, Christian and other, which can shed any ray of light upon the text. Occasional attacks upon the critical position will hardly carry conviction to those who have learned to respect Wellhausen more than Dr. Hertz does. In the comment on the crucial passages 3¹³ 6³, for example, we are told that 'name' in 3¹³ means 'fame' or 'record,' and that 6³ does not imply that the name יהוה was not known, but only that it was not fully understood. Instead of the translation 'ye shall spoil the Egyptian' in 3²² (cf. 12³⁶), Dr. Hertz offers 'ye shall *save* the Egyptians,' *i.e.* clear their name, vindicate their humanity. If this also does not sound very convincing, the case is at any rate well argued.

But no difference of opinion on critical questions can blind readers to the spiritual value of this commentary. Moral and religious interests are dominant throughout, and it is significant that, in dealing with the Decalogue, Dr. Hertz offers a little chapter on 'The Moral Chaos of our Times' with their new ethic and new psychology. The Haftorahs include passages from Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. It is a great convenience to have Hebrew and English texts printed—and so beautifully printed!—on opposite pages; and there are two excellent maps, one of Palestine in the time of the Judges, and the other of the Sinaitic peninsula. This wise and helpful book deserves the grateful attention not only of Jews, but of Christians interested in the Jewish approach to the Bible. For a book so attractive alike in contents and form the price is incredibly low.

There is something both intellectually and spiritually helpful in *The Worth of Prayer, and Other Essays*, by Mr. Edward Grubb, M.A. (James Clarke; 5s. net). We do not really do justice to the book in saying as much. There are few writers with just

the combination of gifts Mr. Grubb possesses. He is alive to all the influences and contributions of our time. He is broad-minded, both in the sense of being mentally hospitable and in the sense of being untraditional, if such a horrid word be permitted. This book has essays on 'Prayer,' on 'Jesus Christ and Historical Criticism' (specially good), on 'The Christian Idea of God' (referred to elsewhere), on 'Divine Revelation: Fact or Fancy?' on 'The Significance of the Resurrection,' and other subjects nearly as interesting. And on them all Mr. Grubb has something fresh, and something worth while, to say. In this brief notice we can only suggest to the reader (and purchaser) of books that here is one that will delight and enlighten him on nearly every page.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have collected twenty-four sermons by the Rev. Hubert L. Simpson, and published them with the title *The Nameless Longing* (7s. 6d. net). It is a volume which may be read through as easily as a novel. There is a freshness of appeal about Mr. Simpson's thought, and he has an ingenious way of presenting his ideas that surprises and holds the attention. And yet there is no playing to the gallery. These are sermons, not sensational talks. And there is a fine simplicity about them. We quoted one, in shortened form, in 'The Christian Year' last month.

One of our religious problems in this country is reunion. In America they are proceeding rather on the lines of federation, and they are trying to work out a system of federation that will not only save money but prevent conflict and temper and bring in a uniting and consecrated spirit. Mr. H. Paul Douglass has made exhaustive investigations into the situation in many American cities under the auspices of the Institute of Social and Religious Research (of which Dr. John R. Mott is chairman), and the results are published in a large paper-bound volume of five hundred odd pages, with Charts, Tables, Appendices—a most elaborate review, with the title *Protestant Co-operation in American Cities* (Institute of Social and Religious Research, New York; \$3.50). We may have to adopt the same line of federation in our country if reunion is hopeless, and in that case (and any other) this volume will be full of light and leading.

It was a fine compliment to Principal W. B. Selbie that he should be invited to deliver the 'William Belden Noble Lectures' at Harvard

University, and a deserved tribute to his representative position in this country. The result is a volume of great interest—*Religion and Life* (Milford; 6s. net). Dr. Selbie reminds us, more than any other writer of the present time, of Dr. Dale. His style, both of thought and writing, is 'massive.' There is also a calm confidence in his own position that is reassuring. But these qualities are based on both scholarship and thinking. In the volume before us they are illustrated afresh. *Religion and Life* is an apologetic for Christianity, the best kind of apologetic, namely, a persuasive and broad-minded presentation of it. There are chapters on 'Religion and History,' on 'The Psychological Interpretation of Religion,' on 'Belief in God,' on 'Religion and Ethics,' on 'The Christian Contribution,' and on 'Eternal Life.' The very topics are appetizing, and the treatment is satisfying and immensely helpful. Dr. Selbie is 'up-to-date' in the sense that he knows the best thought, positive and negative, of our day. But he is always steady in his treatment, and his many readers will find his book a constant source of stimulus and pleasure.

A beautiful volume of Bible stories is called *The Greatest Gift*, written by Mr. Maurice Kerr and Miss Eleanor E. Helme, and published by the Religious Tract Society (7s. 6d. net). The book is on the same lines, and of the same appearance, as 'The Precious

Gift,' which is well known and widely valued. The stories here are told very simply for little children. It is, indeed, doubtful whether some of them (the Flood, for example, and the Sacrifice of Isaac) should appear in such a collection, and for such a constituency, at all. But these are few in number, and for the most part the matter is suitable and suitably presented. The book is beautifully printed, and it is adorned by thirty-two coloured plates by Harold Copping.

Ventures in Belief, edited by Mr. Henry P. Van Dusen (Scribner's; 7s. 6d. net), contains a dozen essays, by the same number of American writers, on various themes connected with the Christian faith. Each essay is prefaced by a short biographical sketch of the writer. These sketches are, on the whole, useful and informing, but they would have been more pleasing had they been a little less eulogistic. The essays are, as one might expect, of varying degrees of excellence. Some are rather slight, but others are notably good, particularly those by Wieman on the Physical World, Fosdick on the Church, and Rufus Jones on Prayer. The general standpoint of the writers may be described as liberal evangelical, and the book, issued under the auspices of the Student Christian Movement of America, is designed especially for the youth of the colleges, though it should prove none the less helpful to many of an older generation.

2 Corinthians xi. 12.

BY THE REVEREND J. F. MOZLEY, M.A., LONDON.

2 Co 11¹² reads: ὁ δὲ ποῶ, καὶ ποιῶ, ἵνα ἐκκόψω τὴν ἀφορμὴν τῶν θελούντων ἀφορμὴν, ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καυχῶνται εὐρεθῶσιν καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς. These words present a great difficulty. St. Paul gives a reason why he will continue to refuse to take money from the Corinthian church. To do so would give his enemies a handle against him in the matter wherein they boast. It is clear, therefore, that their boast had something to do with money. There are three main lines of interpretation.

I. The second ἵνα is parallel with the first (or perhaps dependent on ἐκκόψω), and describes Paul's intention. By refusing money he will cause that in the matter of their boasting they be found even

as he; i.e. they boast of refusing support, but any fair-minded inquirer will find that they have no advantage over Paul. This is the simplest interpretation, and in itself makes excellent sense (so Chrysostom, Calvin, Neander, etc.); but an insuperable objection is found in v.²⁰ ('If a man devour you,' etc.), which is thought to prove that the opponents took money from the church. It is replied, however, that they might have taken money privately or on the sly, and yet boasted publicly of their disinterestedness and of their unwillingness to burden the church. Yet even so the further objection is raised that 1 Co 9 and 2 Co 11 imply that Paul was singular in his refusal

of support. This interpretation, therefore, has gained no support in recent years. To it we will return later.

II. Some (e.g. Beza, Heinrici) understand the grammar of the sentence and the general situation much as above, but take the second *ἵνα* to express St. Paul's final aim. He will force them in the matter of their boasting to come up to his level, i.e. to give up their secret ways of gaining and to become disinterested in deed as well as in word. His example will shame them out of their covetousness. But this interpretation, in addition to the disadvantages which it shares with the last, has some fresh disadvantages of its own. It is altogether off the point; there is no question of Paul benefiting or converting his foes; he is in the thick of the struggle, hard put to to defend himself against them. Moreover, to get them to give up one piece of hypocrisy, while they continued to oppose him in other ways, would be a change of little value to Paul.

III. Nearly all recent commentators, therefore (e.g. Menzies, Plummer, Windisch, Goudge), understand the verse in a quite different way. The second *ἵνα* is not parallel to the first, but goes closely with ἀφορμὴν, and expresses the opponents' wish and not Paul's. They desire an occasion of forcing him down to their level. They openly accept money and boast of it as a mark of apostleship, and would like to goad him to do the same. But this view has grave objections, as indeed Windisch points out. (i) To take *ἵνα* with ἀφορμὴν is against the run of the sentence. (ii) As the change would be on Paul's side, one would expect εὐρεθῶμεν καθὼς καὶ αὐτοί. (iii) If they boast of taking money as a mark of their superiority, how can they possibly wish Paul to imitate them? The answer given is that, though they openly boast, they secretly are ashamed and feel that Paul's example is nobler than theirs, and ἐν ᾧ καυχῶνται refers to the shame beneath the boast. But this is very strained and obscure, and seems hardly possible.

What, then, is to be done? Windisch suggests altering the text, but is there not something to be said for the first interpretation? Let us consider the situation more closely. St. Paul had from the first refused regular support in Macedonia, Achaia, and Asia, though sometimes he accepted spontaneous gifts from trusted friends at a distance and may perhaps have taken hospitality, e.g. in Lydia's house at Philippi. In 1 and 2 Th. (both letters written from Corinth), and in Ac 20^{33f.} he gives three reasons for this: (a) he will not burden his

beloved converts; (b) he would set an example of orderly work and self-sacrifice; (c) he will not offer any one the chance of charging him with covetousness. This third reason is hinted at rather than openly stated.

In 1 Co 9 he deals at some length with the matter, some question evidently having been raised about it in Corinth. He vehemently claims the same right of maintenance as the other apostles, but glories in refusing to use the right. He will not be a hindrance to the gospel; nay, his gratuitous preaching is an extra bit of sacrifice, gladly embraced by him as a mark of his zeal for Christ and his readiness to become all things to all men. It is important, however, to observe that in this chapter he is only comparing himself with genuine apostles, e.g. Peter and James, men whom, despite differences, he reckoned as true allies. The phrase, 'If others partake of this right over you' (v.¹²), will naturally refer to Apollos and other faithful teachers of the Corinthian church. If, therefore, St. Paul is singular in 1 Co 9, that proves nothing about the false apostles of 2 Co.; for in 1 Co. these men are not in view at all.

But in 2 Co. the situation is entirely changed. The false teachers have arrived with letters of commendation and intrude shamelessly in Paul's sphere. They set up as true apostles of Christ, and attack violently Paul's appearance, methods, motives, and claims. The field was not unfavourable. The Corinthian church was not conspicuous (cf. 1 Co.) for steady unity or cool judgment; also Paul was a long way off, and unscrupulous men might discredit him before he had a chance to reply. When once suspicion was aroused about his genuineness, his past career would be mercilessly criticised and sinister meanings found in actions that had hitherto appeared harmless or even laudable. Thus it came about that he found himself the target of charges that seem palpably absurd or contradictory. He was said to be cowardly, fickle, crooked in his dealing, and wanting in love towards his Corinthian converts. As to money, two charges were made. (a) That he had 'burdened' and 'made gain' out of the church (7² 12¹⁴⁻¹⁸). That the latter verb (πλεονεκτεῖν) is used in the very common sense of covetousness or money gain is proved by its being linked in 12^{14ff.} with 'burden' (καταβαρεῖν, καταναρκεῖν); for Paul, having rebutted the charge that he himself burdened the church, turns to the alternative version that he had 'made a gain' of them through Titus. (b) That his refusal of support was a slight on Corinth and showed his want of affection, seeing that he had

even in Corinth taken money from other churches (11^{10f.} 12¹³).

But did the false apostles claim to preach gratuitously? We have no evidence for it, unless in our disputed verse; but on the face of things it is likely enough. Despite introductory letters, they could not win control of the church without dislodging Paul from its affections. But Paul always had warm friends, and these would fight vigorously for him. In point of fact the newcomers never won over the church as a whole; for Paul, shortly after writing 2 Co., stayed three months in Corinth, and neither in Acts nor in the Epistle to the Romans (written in those three months) is there any hint of special internal trouble in the church; nay, more, he left Corinth with the Corinthian collection for the Jerusalem saints, which had been suggested before by him and was now successfully accomplished. The situation had been alarming and dangerous, but St. Paul and his friends weathered the storm. But, unless the false apostles could succeed in winning over the bulk of the church, it is hard to see how they can have received regular church support. Would the Pauline party allow church money to be paid to strangers who at once began to attack the revered Founder of the church? Until the newcomers made good their own footing and discredited Paul, it seems improbable that they can have done anything more than take money and support from their own partisans. It was first necessary to win over Paul's friends. These spoke gratefully of Paul's love for them, e.g. of his gratuitous ministry. It would be natural enough for the newcomers to reply that they also were disinterested in their love and had no intention of burdening the church. This claim might be insincere, but it would be a useful weapon under the circumstances. Doubtless, as they became more secure, their confidence grew, and their high-handed behaviour led to St. Paul's vehement charges against them of enslaving, devouring, entrapping, smiting in the face (11²⁰). But the single word 'devour,' especially occurring in a verse so passionate in feeling and so pictorial in language, is not enough to prove that they openly demanded and received church money as their right. It might refer to the hospitality and support taken from their partisans, or to other underhand or private gains.

Let us now consider 11¹⁻¹⁵ and see whether it fits into such a situation. 'Bear with me,' he begins

(vv.1-6), 'for I fear you may be misled; you bear with the newcomers and I am not behind them. I may be rude in speech, but not in knowledge, as I have shown in all ways towards you.' His mind now turns to his past sacrifices; it cuts him to the quick to be now charged with want of love and even with covetousness. 'Gained out of you, did I?' he retorts (vv.7-12), 'no doubt, then, my preaching to you for nothing was a sin! If I gained out of anybody, it was out of Macedonia (ἄλλας ἐκκλησίας, very emphatic); for them I robbed in order to minister to you. I never was a burden on you, nor will I be in future. No one shall stop me of this boasting in Achaia, whatever I may have done as regards Macedonia. Some of you say it is because I love you not, but God knows that is a false charge. My reason is that I thus deprive my foes of a handle; for despite all their boasts of disinterestedness they cannot make themselves out to be more disinterested than I am.' As he dictates the last words, he thinks of the real character of these men underneath their boasts, and bursts out: 'For such are false apostles, Satanic hypocrites, etc., who will come to a bad end' (vv.13-15).

Now this interpretation takes our disputed v.12 in a natural and straightforward way. It also gives force to the strong word 'robbed' (ἐσίγησα) which is suddenly introduced in v.8. For in vv.7-9 Paul is not, as is usually supposed, defending himself against the charge of refusing support and therefore of being no true apostle, but against the charge of covetous dealing. He sarcastically takes up the word συλᾶν as a stronger variant of the word πλεονεκτεῖν. Perhaps, indeed, συλᾶν had also been used by his enemies against him.

Some, however, may feel that under this interpretation the statement in v.12 becomes rather mild one. For St. Paul, knowing them to be hypocrites, yet takes their boast at its face value and defends himself against it. Yet Paul sometimes uses such under-statements. There is another in this very passage (v.5; cf. 12¹¹). 'I reckon,' he says, 'that I am in nothing behind the super-apostles,' whereas in fact he knew, and says later, that he was far above them and that they were not apostles at all. So also in v.12 he is content for a moment with a defensive argument (perhaps with a touch of irony); but in the next verses he bursts out with his real opinion and vigorously denounces their deceit and false pretensions.

Letters to Women on the Christian Faith.

A Philosopher to a Lady: On Religion.

BY PROFESSOR JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., NEW YORK.

FROM time to time in the history of Christianity women have shown an interest in the faith which has manifested itself in literature. Sometimes they have been writers themselves, and sometimes they have been the cause of treatises or epistles. Last year I wrote a little study in the *Canadian Journal of Religious Thought* upon the letter of Ptolemæus the gnostic in the second century to a lady called Flora. But in the next century another lady is the recipient of a religious tract or treatise, and it is on this epistle that I am now asked to write a word. Neither lady was an orthodox Christian; Flora belonged to the gnostic movement, and Marcella, who forms our present subject, was married to a Neoplatonist, so that the pair were on the fringe of Christianity and no more. But they were both intelligent women, serious-minded and plainly interested in more than children and cooking. Neither could have been described like the Lady Crewe of whom Pepys wrote, that she was 'the same weak silly lady as ever, asking saintly questions.'

Porphyry, the husband of Marcella, flourished in the second half of the third century. He was the biographer of his master Plotinus, and by his works not only interpreted Neoplatonism to his age, but did damage to Christian apologetics in some incisive writing, of which unfortunately we possess merely fragments. As Augustine remarked, he despised Christianity, although he admired Christ—a type which is not yet extinct among philosophers. However, our interest is in one writing from his pen, a letter to his wife, in which he discusses some of what were to him the vital issues of religion. Porphyry was an ascetic, and indeed by temperament a celibate. He had not married till he was in middle life, and the tale of his motives is a curious self-revelation. Busy with the task of editing the works of Plotinus and of composing treatises on Neoplatonic philosophy, he suddenly surprised his friends by marrying a middle-aged widow. Marcella was not to Porphyry what Dorothea was to Mr. Casaubon, for she was neither young nor unencumbered. As Porphyry reminds her in this letter, she had been left with a large family of seven children, five of them girls; she was not wealthy, and she did not enjoy robust health. However, she seems to have shared the

philosophy of her second husband. Indeed, when he had to leave her in Sicily and travel abroad, on a religious mission to Greece, she was so upset over his departure that he wrote her a long letter by way of consolation, with good counsels on the management of life and on the Neoplatonic code of personal morals. The fact is, as we read it, we begin to wonder whether it is really a letter and not a tract thrown into epistolary form. The bulk of it has no reference to Marcella herself; Porphyry expatiates upon his philosophy of life as if he were preaching or lecturing. And some of the personal references do not strike us as being in the best of taste. But the latter point ought not to be pressed, for Porphyry had no romance in his nature, and his philosophy shut him off from any warm interest in what would normally occupy the mind of an absent husband writing to his wife. Unless we recollect his aloofness from anything like human affection or domestic ties, we may misjudge him when he tells Marcella coolly that he had not married her 'for the sake of having children, since I thought that lovers of true wisdom are my children, and that your children would be mine as well, if they should ever embrace the right philosophy of life, when we had educated them.' Nor, he calmly explains, did I marry you to secure a nurse in my advancing years, 'for you are delicate yourself, and more in need of being looked after by others than able to help or tend them.' Making rather a parade of his chivalry, he unchivalrously reminds her that he had thought it a pity to leave her unprotected. Evidently her relatives had objected to the wedding, but Porphyry recalls how he carried his point, risking misunderstanding and malicious comment, because he was persuaded that she had the root of the matter in her and that under his training she would become a true Neoplatonist. There is a note of unpleasant detachment about all this, one is bound to confess.

Poor Marcella was only human, and when her husband refused to take her abroad with him she missed his company so acutely that he felt moved to write this letter to her, he says, so that in his absence she might work out her Neoplatonic salvation. They had been married for only ten months, and she was apparently quite willing to

have left her family in Sicily and to have enjoyed her husband's company. This he would not permit. So he endeavours to comfort her for the absence of 'him who sustains your soul, who is to you father, husband, teacher, kindred, yes, if you will, and fatherland.' Lofty words, but 'husband' is somewhat out of place.

It is only at the beginning and at the end that any intimate references are introduced. Porphyry exhorts her, for example, not to let her housekeeping cares divert her from her religion, that is from the philosophy which he had begun to instil into her. She will need that, to rise above spiteful gossip and worries of the home. Be sensible, he tells her, not emotional. 'Education means not absorbing a vast amount of knowledge but purging the soul from affections.' This is rarefied doctrine; Marcella wanted more than education from her husband. However, towards the close, he condescends to offer her some practical advice about managing her slaves. 'Try never to wrong them, nor to correct them when you are in a passion. And before you correct them, show them that you are doing it for their good, and give them a chance of explaining their conduct. When you buy slaves, avoid those who are stubborn.' He adds, but do not let yourself be dependent on the service of others in the household. 'Accustom yourself to do much for yourself.' And so on. Unfortunately the letter breaks off at this point, just as Porphyry seems to be coming down from the heights of philosophy to the plain of practical life. It is a pity that he does not do more than give such serious advice on housekeeping!

But the philosophy which fills the rest of the letter is not without significance. Even when the writer seems to have forgotten all about his correspondent, he never forgets the principles of his religious philosophy; of them he writes with a depth of conviction which is all the more interesting that it reveals the private feelings of a Neoplatonist in the third century upon his personal principles. One misses the practical concentration of Anselm's letters to religious women, royal or monastic, and the poignant note of Schleiermacher's letter to his wife. It was not in Neoplatonism, as Porphyry conceived it, to sanction any such relations of intimacy between man and woman, even though they were married. Still, the sincerity of his exposition is unmistakable. He preaches to Marcella first and foremost the abiding presence of the Deity within the pure-hearted. Why long for my physical presence, he pleads, as though you had no one to guide you and enrich your life when I am

absent? You and I may enjoy communion of spirit, if you will but follow Plato's advice and recall yourself to the centre of your being. 'The mind of the wise is consecrated as its temple, and to know Him best is to honour Him best.' Right thoughts of Him, meditation upon His inward presence, that is the saving thing in life. As for prayer? Well, prayer must rise from a life eager in the quest for purity and goodness. 'The prayer of the idle is but empty words.' Pray only for spiritual blessings, not for anything bodily. 'Be sure of this, that as one longs for the body and the things of the body, he is failing to know God, he is blind to the sight of God, even though all men may regard him as a god.' And by the things of the body Porphyry means not simply physical desires but much of what St. Paul groups under 'the flesh' (although, by the way, there is little or no evidence that Porphyry was indebted to the Apostle here or elsewhere). For he proceeds to warn Marcella or the audience he may have in mind, that deceitfulness and lying as well as the love of money pertain to love of the body. Prayer is good, he admits, but let it be reverent, not effusive. Beware of talking much about God, also, 'for the wise honour God even as they keep silence, whereas the foolish dishonour Him even while they are praying and offering sacrifices.' Porphyry maintains that deeds are the best recognition of God, and further that one must never imagine that God needs us. We need Him, and all our task is to provide for His indwelling presence a mind purified by the thought that 'He is ever present, overlooking all your thoughts and deeds.' In a word, as he sums up his counsel on this point, 'a prayer accompanied by base actions in life is impure and therefore unacceptable to God; prayer accompanied by noble deeds is pure and at the same time acceptable.'

From this he passes to the four first principles of religion, 'faith, truth, love, and hope. We must have faith that in turning to God we are saved—the only way of our salvation. Having faith, we must strive with might and main to know the truth about God. Then as we know this, we must love Him whom we know, and loving Him we must nourish our souls on good hopes for life.' The addition of 'truth' to the New Testament 'faith, hope, and love' is significant.

Then come ten or eleven paragraphs on the Neoplatonic scheme of the three laws. The law of nations relates to international affairs, but it fails to reach the world of motives; Porphyry views this as an external regulation. The law of Nature, again, which regulates the physical desires of man

Wolsey Hall, Oxford

Founded



in 1894

POSTAL TUITION

FOR

B.D.

DEGREE EXAMS.

During the years 1922-1929

152

WOLSEY HALL STUDENTS
PASSED

B.D. Degree Exams. of London (53), Durham (31), Lampeter (28), Dublin (24), and other Universities.

AT LONDON UNIVERSITY

B.D. HONS.

(EXTERNAL) JUNE 1930:

2 Wolsey Hall Students Sat,
BOTH PASSED, AND WERE
THE ONLY
SUCCESSFUL CANDIDATES

Also in a wide range of Theological Subjects
from amongst which the undermentioned form a very small selection:

Apologetics
Aramaic
Biblical History
Church History
Comparative Religion
Dogmatics
Ethics

Greek
Hebrew
Homiletics
Liturgiology
Missions, History and Methods
New Testament, Old Testament:
Theology, Canon, Text, History

Pastoral Theology
Patristics
Philosophy, Theological
Psychology of Religion
Sermon Preparation
Social Questions

Prospectus Free

An 80-pp. Prospectus and Specimen Lesson will be sent on receipt of request giving full particulars of exam. or subject in which tuition may be required. Address the Secretary, Dept. GE 45,

Wolsey Hall, Oxford

PROPRIETORS: DIPLOMA CORRESPONDENCE COLLEGE, LTD

BAPTIST UNION MINISTERIAL EXAMINATIONS, 1930: 20 WOLSEY HALL STUDENTS SAT--17 PASSED

WHEN WRITING TO ADVERTISERS PLEASE MENTION THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

NOW READY

The New Volume of

THE SPEAKER'S BIBLE

Philippians and Colossians

Price 9s. 6d. net

Edited by

Rev. E. HASTINGS, M.A.

*Full Scholarly Introductions
by*

Rev. Prof. VINCENT TAYLOR, Ph.D., D.D.,
of Wesleyan College, Headingley, Leeds
and

Rev. Canon J. O. F. MURRAY, D.D.,
of Selwyn College, Cambridge.

Other Volumes published in Series:

	Net s. d.		Net s. d.
Luke, Vol. I. . . .	12 6	Luke, Vol. IV. . . .	9 6
Luke, Vol. II. . . .	12 6	I Cor., Vol. I. . . .	9 6
Deuteronomy—Ruth . . .	12 6	I Cor., Vol. II., and Philemon	9 6
I and II Peter and Jude	12 6	Acts, Vol. I. . . .	9 6
Job and Psalms, Vol. I. . .	10 6	Acts, Vol. II. . . .	9 6
Psalms, Vol. II. . . .	10 6	Psalms, Vol. III. . . .	9 6
Ephesians	12 6	Mark, Vol. I. . . .	9 6
James	9 6	Mark, Vol. II. . . .	9 6
Luke, Vol. III. . . .	9 6	The Minor Prophets . . .	9 6

First Number of St. John's Gospel now ready.

Annual Subscription to Serial Issue, 11s. 6d.

'The expositions and interpretations are the fruits of ripe scholarship. The sermons are the fine grains harvested from the best preachers of our time. The illustrations gathered from every department of literature, life, and science are fresh and arresting. Preachers and Bible Class Leaders will find food for many days in these richly stored Volumes. They are triumphs of editorial skill.'—*Melbourne Herald.*

Send for Prospectus to

**'THE SPEAKER'S BIBLE' OFFICE
ABERDEEN**

May we assist you ?

When preparing notes for lectures, or articles for magazines, information is frequently needed, but the necessary sources of information are not at hand. In all probability the books containing the information are to be found in our immense stock of over 2,000,000 of the best books—New, Second-hand, Out-of-print—on all subjects, or we can obtain them. Send us your inquiries, and an immediate reply shall be sent. Better still, the books (if in stock) shall forthwith be sent on seven days' approval. Even though you may not have the title or titles of the books in mind, outline the required information and we will endeavour to find the books you need. There is no extra charge for this service.

119-125 Charing
Cross Road

FOYLES

London
W.C. 2

6/-

NET

THE HEALING OF THE NATION

The Scottish Church and a Waiting People

Edited by the Rev. J. W. STEVENSON, M.A.

A rousing appeal, from a number of eminent members, to the Church to make full use, through the fellowships of which she is composed, of the power of the Spirit in tackling the nation's problems.

38 George St. : **T. & T. CLARK** : Edinburgh

G. TURNBULL

J. ANDERSON

TURNBULL & SPEARS

LETTERPRESS WORKS
THISTLE STREET

EDINBURGH

CHAIRS

For Churches, Halls, Mission Rooms, etc.

Catalogue Free.

MEALING BROS. LTD.

Avenue Chair Works, High Wycombe, Bucks.



Individual Communion Cups

Churches who have not adopted the Individual Communion Cups are invited to write for Free List, and of Memorial Tablets to Dept. E.T.,

TOWNSHENDS LTD.

ERNEST STREET

BIRMINGHAM

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES
RATES FOR ADVERTISEMENTS

26. 6s. per page, smaller spaces *pro rata*. 'Copy' to be received not later than the 12th of the previous month.

ADVERTISMENT DEPARTMENT, Kings Gate, Aberdeen

WHEN WRITING TO ADVERTISERS PLEASE MENTION *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*

is in harmony with the Divine Law, and by practising it, as an ascetic discipline, one attains to that Divine Law. Here Porphyry develops his favourite views on abstinence. 'The veil of flesh hangs dark between Thy blessed face and mine' is not really a Christian but a Neoplatonic sigh. 'It is one great proof of wisdom to keep the body in thralldom,' *i.e.* to crush the passions of fear and desire; he becomes eloquent on this point, particularly as he seems to remember Marcella, 'Never trouble yourself whether you are male or female, never regard yourself as a woman, for I did not approach you as a woman.' Our relationship, he means, has had nothing of mere sex about it. 'Avoid all that is womanish in the soul, as though you had the body of a man.' The teaching here is what is to be found in his other writings; what makes it sound strange is the fact that he addresses it bluntly to his wife. The morbid reaction against the flesh, which was already deflecting monasticism as it was afterwards to deflect some types of mystical religion in the Middle Ages, is already voiced by this Neoplatonist saint and sage. In last century poets like Swinburne were fond of shouting protests against the 'pale Galilean,' as though Christianity had been responsible for fear of the red blood in human nature and suspicious of the powers of vital passion. History in the third century tells a very different tale. Gnostics and Neoplatonists alike were disparaging the body. It was Christianity that had to maintain, by the doctrine of the Incarnation, the reality of human nature. The interpretation was often inadequate, for current tendencies swung many Christians into inconsistent practices and principles, until it seemed as though one ought to be ashamed of the body as one was spiritual. Yet the fundamental principle of the Incarnation was never wholly lost sight of. It was the teaching of lofty souls like Porphyry which turned human nature into a pale phantom. Perhaps there is no clearer

proof of this than the letter which we have been surveying.

Yet let us leave it with appreciation of its ethical teaching. The unhealthy idealism or spiritualism of the letter need not blind us to some admirable counsels in this exhortation to Marcella from her husband. Some of these have been already noted. Here is another, of permanent value. 'It would be absurd to exhort you to worship God, as though that admitted of any question. And we do not worship Him aright by doing this rite or by holding this or that belief.' It is not that Porphyry rules out religious rites. Indeed, he leaves it free to people to worship the deity as their particular national customs dictate. It is not that he disparages even right beliefs about God. What he means in this sentence is that neither outward forms nor intellectual beliefs are equivalent to real worship. It is his way of saying what had been said by the Christians whom he scorned so heartily: 'God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.' And in conclusion—this happens to be the very conclusion of the letter: 'It is not possible for any one who injures man to honour God. Consider the love of mankind to be the basis of your religion.' Whether Marcella needed this counsel or not, others do, even at the present day. How Porphyry intended to develop this argument, we cannot tell. He certainly did not mean that religion was to be resolved into anything like humanitarianism; he was far too genuine a Platonist to take this line. But, for all his disconcerting indifference to human love as a sphere for Divine love, he did not dream of identifying religion with any form of contemplation which sat loose to human duties. The moral conditions which he postulated for spiritual religion involved strict abstinence from bodily passions; yet he was evidently careful to recognize that selfishness in any form was fatal to the perception of reality.

In the Study.

Virginitus Puerisque.

The Tail-Waggers.

BY THE REVEREND E. W. PRICE EVANS, M.A.,
PONTYPOOL.

'I am among you as he that serveth.'—Lk 22²⁷.

DURING my last summer holiday I met a dog. He was a handsome terrier, well-bred and friendly.

His early home was in Penmaenmawr, North Wales, but when I met him he had settled down in a new home near London, and was living on excellent terms with his new mistress. You will not be surprised to learn that his name was Taffy.

Now Taffy was a gentleman, and, like many gentlemen, he was a member of a Club. I was a bit surprised at that. A Club for dogs! It sounds

funny, doesn't it? But there is such a Club, all the same, and a very respectable Club it is too. It is called 'The Tail-Waggers' Club.'

This Club has a badge and a motto, both inscribed on a metal disc which each member carries on his collar. Thus the members remind themselves and tell others of what they are, and of what they are trying to do. The badge consists of two crossed tails and the motto is a very fine one: 'I help my pals.'

There is a connexion between the badge and the motto which I want you to think about. When a dog wags his tail he helps his pals, and when he helps his pals he wags his tail. It is a great privilege to help our pals.

Of course, there are many reasons why a dog wags his tail. There are wags *and* wags. There is the wag of exuberance—wagging the tail from sheer joy of life. It is good to be alive, says the dog, and to be young is very heaven. So he wags his tail. He can't help himself. It almost wags of itself. Then, there is the wag of friendliness, and this is what I want to talk about more especially. See two dogs approaching each other. How their tails wag! They are, as it were, taking their hats off and shaking hands, smiling politely and hopefully. While they are getting to know each other their tails are still wagging. Then, perhaps, they trot off together—two friends.

The more their tails wag the friendlier will dogs be. No wag means no friendship. The still tail spells suspicion and even something worse. Happy is the dog whose tail wags.

Dogs have much to teach us if we are humble and bright enough to learn. Let me tell you a story which Sir Kenneth Mackenzie told some time ago. It is about a police-dog which had been trained to go out every night in search of wounded soldiers in the Great War. One night he found a poor man, badly wounded and caught in the barbed-wire entanglements of 'No-man's land.' In spite of the whistling bullets, the dog released the soldier's clothing, dragged him to a large shell-hole, and carefully put him down on the bottom of the crater. Then, finding his way to an Ambulance Station, he reported his need of help by barking and jumping round members of the corps. His insistence induced two men to follow him, and he led them straight to the shell-hole, where the soldier was found, exhausted but alive. That dog was a friend indeed. A V.C., I dare say, has been given for less.

'I help my pals' is a good motto for boys and girls. But we must not be too narrow in our choice of 'pals.' The police-dog helped men as well

as dogs, and we must learn to help all who are in need. Our 'pals' should be not only members of our family, or school, or church, or town, or country, but anybody or everybody who needs help. For this we require a big heart, and who is there in all the world who can enable us to attain but One whose own heart is full of love for *all* men, even Jesus Christ our Lord? There is nobody else. And He says: 'I am among you as he who serveth.' The more you help your 'pals'—the more you serve—the happier and the better will you be.

The Sanctuary Light.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN G. MORTON, M.A.,
H.C.F., CHATHAM.

'O send out thy light. . . . Then will I go unto the altar of God, unto God my exceeding joy.'—Ps 43^{3, 4}.

'The fire shall ever be burning upon the altar; it shall never go out.'—Lv 6¹³.

Some years ago, in time of war, there was in Spain, as in other places, a lack of many things needful, but what the people needed most and missed most were matches. It was no use for a Spaniard to say to his neighbour, 'Lend me a match, will you?' for his neighbour had not got any matches to lend, which really means—to give. These country people had so long used matches that they had quite forgotten how their forefathers got light from flint and steel and a box of tinder; and though perhaps some of them had read, as you may have, how the shipwrecked sailor on the desert island got a fire by which to dry his sea-soaked clothes from a conflagration kindled by lightning in the jungle grass, and so was saved from death, yet they were not able any more than James and John to command fire to fall from heaven: lightning is not at all obliging; when it comes it comes very quickly, but it doesn't come when you call it.

What did these poor peasants do then, when they came back to their homes at night from their work, and found them all cold and dark, with no fires and no lamps lit? Every night they all went out with their lamps and their candles to the village church, and there they lit them at the lamp which always burns upon the altar, and which is never allowed to go out. Then the happy lamp-lighters joyfully returned home, carefully shielding the borrowed flame, and from it they lit their other lamps, and kindled the fires upon their hearths.

How grateful those poor Spanish villagers were for this free but so very precious gift of the light! So cheap—it could be got for the going—yet so priceless! How their hearts glowed and kindled

with gratitude for that little faithful gem-like flame on the church's altar! Every household in that village was in debt to their church for the light which brightened their rooms and for the warmth that made them so comfortable. It was that flame on the altar which set the home-fires burning, and lit the kindly lights which shone so cheerfully through their curtains into the night.

No need to ask why those Spaniards went to church. They went for what they could get there, and to procure for nothing—without money and without price—what they could not get anywhere else in the village, even for gold.

And that, too, is just why people go to church here and everywhere, and why they always have gone. They go to God's house and bring back home with them a light to lighten their darkness. They meet God there, and they meet those who love Him there, and as flame kindles flame so 'One loving heart sets another on fire.' The lamp of love, the candle of faith, if they have gone out, as sometimes they do, are lit again. When we go to church and receive the light of God's love into our hearts, our homes are all brighter when we return, and the very atmosphere in which we live and move is far more comfortable.

A great writer, Thomas Carlyle, was brought up in a small village in Scotland, and of its small church he afterwards wrote: 'That poor temple of my childhood is more sacred to me than the biggest cathedral could have been; rude, rustic, bare, no temple in the world was more so: but there were sacred tongues of flame which kindled what was best in one, what has not yet gone out.' In sweeter, simpler words the Psalmist said, 'I was glad when they said unto me, let us go into the house of the Lord.' He was glad because there he received the 'gladsome light.'

And when with us the home-fires of faith and the home-lights of love go out, we too know where to go to have them kindled anew; it is where Jesus went—to His Father's house, to our Father's house.

For like a child sent with a fluttering light To feel his way across a gusty night,
Man walks the world. Again and yet again
The lamps shall be by fits of passion slain.
But shall not He who sent him from the door
Relight the lamp once more, and yet once more?

That, too, is why the sweet singer of Israel first wrote and then sang the prayers of our texts:

'O send out thy light. . . . Then will I go unto the altar of God, unto God my exceeding joy,'
'The Lord send thee help from the sanctuary.'

The Christian Year.

QUINQUAGESIMA.

The Idealism of Jesus Christ.

'And before the throne there was a sea of glass like unto crystal.'—Rev 4⁶.

'And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea.'—Rev 21¹.

1. That the kingdoms of this world can become the kingdoms of our God and of His Christ was the assured confidence of the man who wrote the Book of the Revelation in times that were considerably darker than our own. The value of his message and his vision is not impaired because his identity is impossible to determine; and indeed, as Emerson observed, the nobler the truth or sentiment, the less imports the question of authorship. He was an exiled Christian believer who, because of his faith, had been banished to the lonely island of Patmos. And there, in the solitariness of his isolation, he had the heroic courage and splendour of faith to compose this majestic conception of a victorious Christ.

Down the vistas of the future roved his piercing eye. He saw the vast political and military fabric of the Cæsars crumble into dust, but the Carpenter of Nazareth rise enthroned to a kingdom which would have no end. He visualized the eventual advent of a condition of human society purified, perfected, and irradiated with the spirit of Christ, in which man at last would be emancipated by the indwelling power of the Holy Spirit from his follies, sorrows, selfishness, and sin, and would thereby be freed for ever from the saddest and most desolating of mortal experiences, which is the pain of separation.

He is obsessed by the sea. To him it has no beauty. It exiled him from everything and every one. It cut him off irrevocably from his old familiar world. To the eyes of this isolated watcher it symbolized nothing but the yawning chasm of separation. Never at peace—dark, mysterious, homeless, wandering—it was so like the restless yearning heart of humanity. His mood, however, is not constant. He looks upon the sea with varying emotions. At one time in his dreams it still remains before the throne of God, that loathed waste of waters, but it has become clear as crystal, its enigmas at last unravelled in the light of God's revelation of His ways. At another, and perhaps in an hour of more acute loneliness and depression, there can be no more sea in his vision.

2. Let us then first consider his dream that before the throne there was a sea of glass like unto crystal. The sea is still there among the ultimate things, but it is calm and transparent and clear as crystal. The veil is lifted from off the face of all things, and God's whole purpose is at last revealed. It is grey no longer, that strange cold sea that ravages and divides our human life. You can see through it to its very depths and understand all that it has concealed.

Can those of us who long for the sound of a voice that is still, or who have failed in some cherished enterprise, or who have been beaten or disappointed or thwarted in our hopes, or who have become disillusioned, not having found in life what we once expected to find—can we not see, and seeing take fresh courage, the vision of that crystal sea before the throne 'where the obstinate questionings of the mind will be answered and the heart find rest'?

There are moments when the staggering problems of existence rise up before us and seem to quench the flame of faith. The mind falters before such things as the prosperity of unrighteousness and the many adversities which so often are endured by the children of light.

There is too the mystery of evil. We need not think we can explain it, for neither the formulæ of theologians nor the theories of the philosophic schools afford adequate or satisfactory explanation which man can wholly fit in with his own faith and experience. Back in the mists of antiquity some unknown writer penned the beautiful idyll of the Garden of Eden in order to demonstrate the facts of sin, temptation, and the redemptive power of God. And though we may say that the theory of evolution is biologically and historically more accurate, and that the Ascent of Man is more true than the Fall of Man, neither the one nor the other is fully explanatory of the existence of evil in a universe whose fundamental principle, so Christianity believes, is the law of Divine wisdom, goodness, and love. Did God create evil, or if omnipotent why does He tolerate it? The mystery of evil with all its attendant havoc in the lives of men baffles us and defies our speculation. Here we are, like the man on Patmos, encircled by a silent sea of mystery. Evil exists; yet in our hearts and by our experience we believe and know that God is good.

There is also the problem of pain. And death! How men have longed that some one would come back from that shadowy bourne and deliver up its secret! This indeed is a world of wearying contradictions and baffling enigmas. But we are compelled to believe that it is a just and righteous

world. There are moments of strangely vivid certainty when, as afar off, we seem to catch the gleam of that crystal sea before His throne, and with a faith deeper than all finite knowledge we know that, in spite of all that seems to be, the things of this world are working for each brave and faithful spirit an eternal weight of glory, that the purposes of God are good, and all is well and will be well, and that those who endure unto the end will somewhere and some day find it to be true.

3. But later on the writer of the Book of the Revelation will have no sea at all.

The analogy which to this man's mind appeared between the waters of the *Ægean* and mortal experience is not far-fetched. Dr. George Matheson, in one of his suggestive meditations, has observed that human life has more sea than land: that it is not a connected continent—a brotherhood of souls—but a multitude of little islands divided by stormy waves. There is a great truth in such a statement. And indeed our own personalities rarely achieve an ordered harmony. The discords of division and separation invade them. We stress so much that is unimportant, and frequently lay but little emphasis on much that matters everything. Nor is our life in its social aspects a community of brethren bound together by the ties of mutual interests and common purposes.

But the man on Patmos, who knew what human loneliness could be, dreamed a dream of a grander future. He saw the separating waters assuaged. Man drew near to man, and each with a wondering gladness recognized in the other not a potential enemy but a brother and a friend. The misunderstandings were removed, the old suspicions and enmities were stilled. The mountain of the Lord was established above the hills, and classes and nations, relieved from the stultifying limitations of their selfish insularity, flowed together unto it, for there was no more sea.

4. Do we complain that this is simply idealism run riot? Well, it is the idealism of Jesus Christ, and He maintained it to be practical. When we look around us and see 'man's inhumanity to man,' and the catastrophe and suffering that are the fruits of selfishness and passion and utter lack of principle; when we see class antagonisms and racial hatred shouting unashamed—we are forced to recognize that the angry sea that breaks up the unity of men is still, after twenty centuries, very much in evidence.

But across the years rings out the confident cry from Patmos, 'There shall be no more sea.' In the character of Christ, and in the example of every

faithful and unselfish spirit, we have evidence enough of the inward beauty to which the individual can rise. What others have shown to be possible cannot be rejected by us as beyond our powers. That which has been done can be done again, and the heights of moral and spiritual loveliness which men and women have scaled we dare not classify as unattainable by ourselves.

5. Baron von Hügel tells us that the Christian faith is a contagious thing. It is more caught than acquired.

Let us be practical and begin, but not end, in revising our whole attitude to those who compose our own intimate circle. Christianity begins at home, and no attempts to put it into practice outside can give people the right to call themselves disciples of Jesus who at their own firesides and amid the circle of their personal friends are being selfish and self-centred and causing strife and dispeace. The Christian will also evidence this spirit in the wider affairs of corporate life. He will in business be honest and fair, just and upright, remembering his duty to those who serve him and whom he serves, and that no Christian dare exploit or deceive those for whom his Saviour died.

He will remember too that the problem of peace—peace among the nations and peace among all classes and conditions of men—is the critical problem with which the statesmanship of the modern world is faced and upon the solution of which the future of the world depends. Thus he will hesitate to support aught that is calculated to embitter public opinion, benefit one section of the community at the expense of another, foster antagonisms, inflame passion and prejudice, or accentuate those divisions which separate men from each other.¹

FIRST SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Finality of the Cross.

'Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more.'—Ro 6⁹.

1. The Crucifixion can never happen again. Is it possible to enter, with some faint degree of imagination, into what this meant for our Lord Himself? Sometimes a man is haunted, it may be for days and years, by some ghost which refuses to be laid. Some dreadful possibility lurks in the skirts of circumstance, and he is never sure at what moment it may leap out upon him. But by and by the man finds that his deliverance has arrived. The man

who was whetting his dagger against him passes to a world where his enmity is impotent for ever. Or the set of circumstances which conspired against him is dissolved by the touch of time. Or the painful experience comes upon the man in the worst fulfilment of his fears, but this is a revolving world, and the scheme of things is a moving scheme, and the hour of extremity passes as other things pass, to return no more. The words *No more* in such circumstances are very sweet. They turn into 'a slow contented song.' In such an hour it is possible to appreciate the music of that trumpet-voiced *No more* in the story of the Exodus. 'And Moses said unto the people, Fear ye not, for the Egyptians whom ye have seen to-day, ye shall see them again *no more* for ever.' Men of later days in other senses have had Pharaoh hot upon their heels. But the hour comes when peril is definitely left behind, and their hearts cry 'No more' with infinite relief and with passionate thanksgiving.

But we are considering the case of our Lord Himself. The Cross did not come upon Him entirely as a surprise. The Holman Hunt picture which shows the shadow of a cross falling dark upon the Nazareth workshop is more than an artist's fancy: it is a transcript of history. As far back as our records take us into the earlier life of Jesus we find the shadow and suggestion of the Cross. We link together the phrase of His boyhood, 'I must be about my Father's business,' and its glimpse of a dominating necessity, with that later glimpse of the ruling imperative, 'The Son of Man must go into Jerusalem, and suffer, and be killed.' The same shadow seemed to steal even into the brighter moments of the earlier ministry, when He and His disciples together were glad with the gladness of the spring-time. 'Can the children of the bride-chamber fast,' He asked some of His sour-hearted critics, 'while the bridegroom is with them?' But even into this circle of sunshine the shadow stole, dark and cold and threatening. 'The days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken away.' There is no need to recount how prominent the same thought became as the years went on, not only in His own mind but in His repeated lessons to His disciples: the experiences of His life and ministry became more and more clearly milestones on the way to the Cross.

We love to think of the Resurrection from the point of view of the disciples, the surprise of it, the overwhelming gladness it brought, the new world it created, just to be on this side of the Cross and the Tomb. But we may put a little reverent imagination into the conception of what this meant to our

¹ C. L. Warr, *Scottish Sermons and Addresses*, 14.

Lord Himself—to have the Cross behind and not before. The poverty and discipline of this mortal life were over. The buffeting at the hands of men and all the bitterness of death were left behind. His flawless offering was accepted of the Father, and the narrow, local task was merging into the world-wide ministry to which all power in heaven and on earth was promised. It is not written in the immortal story, yet faith and love bid imagination do its poor best to picture it—the new light that was in His eyes, and the new royalty in His mien, and the new gladness in His voice, as He came again into the circle of His friends to say, ‘Peace be unto you.’ Peace was in His own heart, peace unutterable yet overflowing, such peace as those know who have crossed their Red Sea and won their land of promise. For the cup was drained: the burden was borne, and the Cross could never be repeated. ‘Christ being raised from the dead *dieth no more*.’

2. Yet in this passage the glorious finality of the Cross is viewed more from the standpoint of the Christian than from that of the Christ. The passage reads as though, even after the Christ Himself had travelled past Calvary and all its woe, the Cross were left standing in its socket beside the highway to mark the definite ending of one great stage of experience. Itself final, it is an emblem of finality. The Christian, like his Lord, leaves behind an experience which is negative, humiliating, and in the strict sense mortifying, that he may pass on to one which is positive, enlarging, and vitalizing. Dr. Moffatt thus renders the fourth verse: ‘Our baptism into death made us share His burial, so that, as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might live and move in the new sphere of life.’ In that phrase about sharing His burial we can see a whole pageant of self-oblation: the dying and entombment of the Lord are to the Apostle’s eye not a solitary fact—he sees an endless company of believing men following in the same hard way and learning the same stern lesson. Yet the pageant of that sombre road moves on into the sunshine and becomes a pageant of self-realization. As the Apostle watches his Lord coming forth to a new day of power and joy, he sees that for believing men also the negative stage, the disciplinary stage, the crucifixion stage is not the end—they also come on to the ‘new sphere of life,’ where they almost forget the crucifixion of the flesh in the liberty of the spirit, and cease to reckon what they have parted with because they rejoice so greatly in what God bestows.

It may be granted that St. Paul was an idealist. A stronger word might be better—a word less

intellectual and more warmly human. It might be wiser to call him a great believer—a great believer for others as well as for himself.

3. If modern men are to make anything of this Pauline idealism, they must put their wills into it. It is not enough to leave it upon the cold printed page and study it with admiration and surprise. Did not the Lord cry an exultant *No more* to the dominion of Death when He came forth into life on the Resurrection morning? So the believing man by all the desires, intents, and purposes of his consecrated heart will cry *No more* to the dominion of evil in the hour of his self-surrender—a joyful *No more*, a defiant *No more*, a firm and resolute *No more*: ‘I am not thine, but free and for ever hate thee.’ That is the meaning of St. Paul’s charge to his readers: ‘Reckon ye yourselves to be dead unto sin.’ Even if it be not in the full sense actually so; even if the volcano still slumbers beneath the ashes of its former fires; even if the old life still sometimes rises from its grave and fumbles with the latch of its sepulchre—‘reckon yourselves to be dead unto sin.’ Act as if it were so. Act as if the ideal were the real. Live up to your better selves—not looking back or turning back. That is the appeal. And all things are possible to the hearts that loyally respond to it, for the power that raised Christ from the dead is at their service, to turn their visions into realities and their purposes into fulfilments.

For men who put their wills into this high task must put their faith into it too. Paul will have it that the idealism of this passage, and indeed of all his letters, is not his own idealism but God’s: ‘the glory of the Father,’ shining through Cross and Resurrection, glows through all these counsels and hopes. Christian men may sing:

Lo! between our sins and their reward
We set the passion of Thy Son our Lord.

Yet they can only set between their past and their present that arresting, decisive, transforming sign, because God Himself has set it there, and made it impossible for them to get behind it or to live as though it had never been. And when they answer with faith and resolution, He has His great *No more* of promise with which to answer the *No more* of their detachment from the world and attachment to Himself. Are they darkened by their ignorances and misunderstandings? ‘The sun shall be *no more* thy light by day, but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory.’ Does the earth-life on to its close seem haunted by limitations, failures, and regrets? ‘He shall wipe

away every tear from their eyes; and death shall be *no more*; neither shall there be mourning, nor crying, nor pain, any more: the former things are passed away.' Thus, with Redeeming Mercy behind them, around them, before them, the children of promise move onwards, from the Cross to the Crown.¹

SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Severity of God.

'For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold down the truth in unrighteousness.'—Ro 1¹⁸ (RV).

'And these shall go away into eternal punishment: but the righteous into eternal life.'—Mt 25⁴⁶ (RV).

There is a marked tendency to-day to neglect the severer side of Christ's teaching about God and judgment to come. A century ago the doctrine of eternal punishment, which was interpreted as everlasting punishment, was in the ascendant. Appeal was made for support of missions to the heathen, on the ground that the unconverted heathen went to hell. A change has come over our thought since then, which is certainly in part due to the following reasons. First, all theological dogmas are increasingly being brought to the bar of conscience. Dogma is being ethically criticised, and any dogma which is felt to contradict the verdict of the moral sense is rejected. It is obviously unfair to condemn to everlasting punishment men who have never had a chance of knowing the truth as it is in Jesus.

Secondly, scholarship has done much to recover for us the background of Jewish thought about the future, against which Christ's utterances on judgment to come must be viewed. A large number of those utterances are quotations from Jewish apocalyptic books current at the time, and the language used is pictorial, and is not to be taken literally. Criticism has raised the question, which has seriously to be faced, whether the genuine teaching of Jesus about the future has not been coloured and heightened by those who committed the record of His life to writing.

Thirdly, the stress rightly laid upon the duty of the Christian to be up and doing in the service of humanity, the loud call in an age which is interested in social and economic problems to share the common burden and spend and be spent for others, have tended to weaken the sense of sin, and make men think that what they are doing for humanity

is more important than what they are in themselves.

Lastly, one of the most notable features in the recent development of theology has been its emphasis on the Fatherhood of God. This is due to the recovery of the historical Jesus, as He lived and taught in Palestine. Jesus the pitiful, the humane, the sympathetic, fills the canvas. We are bidden see Him trying to establish on earth the Kingdom of God, setting us an example of service and self-sacrifice, and using none of the traditional theological vocabulary about sin.

Now in trying to appreciate any system of teaching, we must, if we are to be fair to it, take the whole of it into account. Can it be denied that in the teaching of Jesus there is a terribly severe side? Whatever allowance may have to be made for the possibility that some of His teaching about the future was coloured by those who wrote the Gospels, we cannot strike out all that He said about judgment to come. Nor do all His severer sayings occur in the apocalyptic sections of the narrative. It is only a subjective criticism which has run riot that will refuse to admit that He spoke in the gravest terms about the fate of the impenitent. Consider the tremendousness of such sayings as these: 'Whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven.' 'Fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.' And, though the language is pictorial and symbolical, consider the emphatic gravity of the terms used to describe the exclusion of the impenitent from the Kingdom—'the unquenchable fire'; 'where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched'; 'eternal punishment'; 'this place of torment.' Jesus plainly contemplated the shutting out of the wicked from the Kingdom of God. He spoke of the possibility of sinning 'an eternal sin,' and asked, 'What shall a man be profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and forfeit his life?' It is certain that He spoke of judgment to come, and said that judgment would be according to character.

Jesus said very little to satisfy our natural curiosity about the next life: His teaching on that subject is marked by a great reserve. But two things He made plain: first, that man lived on beyond the grave; secondly, that this life was a period of probation, and that according to our use of this life, so would be our destiny in the next. Do not our own spiritual intuitions confirm the verdict that a moral judgment awaits us? The ethical argument for immortality has always been a strong argument. We feel, not only that the

¹ J. M. E. Ross, *The Tree of Healing*, 176.

moral values of character have permanent worth, but also that justice requires that in the next life the good and the bad shall receive different treatment.

What will be the nature of the judgment? We cannot take literally the pictorial language in which the judgment is described. No material flames will scorch the unrepentant sinner. It will be a spiritual judgment, spiritually administered. Here we may ask whether any punishment can be worse than that of remorse? To have brought home to one in a world where no blurring of moral issues is possible one's true spiritual condition? The point, however, to be emphasized is this, that our final state, whether of weal or woe, can be nothing but the necessary completion of our growth here. The finally completed character will be the exact expression of the sum total of all the choices by which the character was gradually shaped. Hence it is profoundly true to say that every day we are passing judgment on ourselves, and making our own heaven or hell. A man's daily choices make plain his character. The process is continuous. When the end comes the man will have made his own destiny. We have only to picture him brought into God's presence, brought, that is, into such a clear spiritual light that no excuses and no disguises are possible, to see that he inevitably becomes his own judge and condemns himself. He could not be happy in heaven because his nature is not heavenly. This is his punishment; he inflicts it on himself by his own act.

Yet it is true to speak of it as God's punishment of him, because the moral order under which we live is of Divine appointment, and it is God who has ordained the law that what a man sows that shall he reap. God's method of punishment can hardly be thought of as belonging to the type of personal intervention. God is not a magnified man. He acts through the moral order and through the working of man's nature. But since sin is more than the violation of the moral order, since it is an offence against a Personal Spirit of Holy Love ('against thee, thee only, have I sinned'), the consequences which follow upon sin may rightly be regarded as bearing on them a personal imprint. They are God reacting as a Personal Being against human transgression.

We are considering the severity of love. God's love is a holy love; God's character is one of perfect moral goodness; and His purpose for man is to form in man a character of the same kind as that which belongs to Himself. Such a love must be severe. God's purpose for man would be defeated,

if there were no principle of moral judgment in His governance of the world. But it is we who call out into operation the severity latent in God's love. At the heart of that love lies the readiness to forgive us, the desire to take us into fellowship with itself.

It is no part of our purpose to discuss at any length the many problems connected with the future destiny of the wicked. We are faced with difficulties which we have no adequate means of solving. Some have held that at the long last all men will be saved; that the unrepentant here, will hereafter, through much remorse and suffering and bitter spiritual discipline, climb gradually back to a state of reconciliation with God. Others hold a belief in Conditional Immortality. Only those survive who are qualified to survive, who have the necessary spiritual survival value. We may speculate without limit; we cannot know the certainty of these things. But if we take the teaching of Jesus as a whole, two principles stand out clearly. There is a continuance of personal life after death; and there is a judgment to come, a judgment by character. Jesus plainly taught that upon this world's choices depend issues which reach out far beyond this life; and that man is the maker of his destiny.

The love of God surrounds us, and calls to us to respond to its appeal. Sin is the refusal to respond, and sin persisted in must alienate the sinner from God.

The love of God, how strong and tender it is! Time and again have we thwarted it, but it is still there, ready to welcome us back again. Let us bring our lives out into the sunlight of that love, see ourselves as we are, and as we may by God's help become, and, if we have wandered from Him, go back to the Father as His children who come to Him because they know that He loves them.¹

THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT.

What's Wrong with the World?

'Nathanael saith unto him, Whence knowest thou me? Jesus answered and said unto him, Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig tree, I saw thee.'—Jn 1⁴⁸.

1. There sits Nathanael under his fig tree, in the solitude of his soul, resting, brooding, wondering, when the curtain of the New Eternity rises upon him. He sits apart. He is as Augustine was in that garden in Milan; he is as Bunyan was as he went aside among the willows by Bedford town;

¹ V. F. Storr, *The Living God*, 153.

he is as Howie was as he sat within his bleak little harbour in the kailyard at Loch-Goin in Fenwick parish. All these, likewise, found Christ, or were found of Christ, or were restored to His nearer communion, as they went apart from the press of life, and so gave themselves to meditation.

Christ has faded for many because the fig tree is faded, because the habit of holy retirement has dried up and is well-nigh dead. It cannot be that our life remains entwined with God's, if our days are rooted less and less in the soil of tranquil thought, within green pastures of quiet prayer, and beside the still waters that come from the gentle effluence of the Holy Spirit. Not even Christ Himself could maintain the vitality of His superabundant soul apart from those descents and ascents of blessed solitude. William Penn says of this: 'Christ Himself was an example of it. He loved, and chose to frequent, mountains, gardens, seashores. It is requisite to the growth of piety, and I reverence the virtue that seeks and uses it, wishing there were more of it in the world.' And Whittier, as he lay aside at Chalkley Hall, said of this:

Here, while the market murmurs, while men throng
The marble floor
Of Mammon's altars, from the crush and din
Of the world's madness, let me gather in
My better thoughts once more.

It may be with us as it was at times with the children in Christ that Moffat won in the Kuruman Mission. It was their habit to pass into the bush to pray, by paths which their pious feet had beaten out. At such times as their father in Christ thought that their prayer had become irregular, or had ceased, he would say to them: 'The grass is growing on your path to prayer.'

2. What was Nathanael thinking of as he sat there alone? Day-dreaming, was he? If so, it was of a Day of days for himself and his countrymen that he dreamed. He had the mind of a Nationalist; or so we may surmise from the salutation Jesus made towards him—'an Israelite indeed!' He loved his country. That was his chief devotion; that, and to know the will of God concerning her. But the times were out of joint. Policies were involved in perplexity. A score of schemes battled for the allegiance of this quiet and 'guileless' spirit.

Our own country to-day abounds with this man Nathanael—quiet thoughtful folk who lack what Nathanael lacked. *They need to come face to face with Jesus Christ.*

3. Let us catch the breath of Christ Jesus, savour

the soul of Him, let our heart inhale the spirit He is of; then shall we feel and know, with a conviction that is higher than all argument, what is wrong with the world, and what shall set it right. First of all, we shall find that He holds the *secret* of all this present turmoil of vagrant counsels and broken pacts. What is that secret if it be not this, that we have smudged, or we have never really known, our native and universal birthright as sons of God and brothers of one another. Again, we shall find that He holds the *solution* of it. What is that solution if it be not this, that we, simply and humbly, and of firm and established will, return to the vision of that heritage, and cease not from this fight, nor let sleep the sword of the Spirit until Jerusalem be pitched with her heavenly pavilions throughout this green and riven land. But, also, this Christ is more than the revealer of this solution or that secret of our discontents. He is Himself the *stand-by* in all we seek to tell men of this advent of the Realm of God among us, and all we do in order to bring that accomplishment to pass.

Here is a treasury untouched by thousands, even of those who have been brought into the King's palace. *Just through there*, there is waiting for us that power of the Grace of the living Christ by which mountains can be lifted up and cast into the midst of the sea. The glory and the marvel of it are diminished by saying that it is 'waiting.' Too often we picture Christ as standing off, aloof, with sad, disappointed, and averted look. In reality, He is to us what He was to Nathanael. He sees us under the trees. He knows our thoughts. He comes to us, saying, 'Lo, I have been looking for you. Come with me; I will stand by you; we will do it together.'¹

FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Idle Word.

'And I say unto you, that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgement.'—Mt 12³⁶ (RV).

Despite the difficulty of the saying, it is really quite unambiguous. It should be noticed that just previously Jesus has been saying that it is out of the abundance of the heart that the mouth speaketh, as if speech was not always to be a matter of a deliberate draught from the well of wisdom, or the restrained utterance of the reason, but was more valuable when it was the expression of superabundant feeling, the spontaneous overflow of the heart. And then comes this word. We must not

¹ A. Boyd Scott, *The Twelve take Stock of us*, 61.

try to get out of the difficulty by translating 'idle' as 'harmful'; the word *means* 'idle.' It is used of a field lying fallow, of a tree not bearing fruit, of the Sabbath because it was free from work. It is expressly distinguished from 'logos,' which always means rational speech, a purposeful word endeavouring to manifest truth; it is mere utterance (*rēma*, a word that just flows out). Therefore an idle word means not only a careless word, but one deliberately so. Jesus is referring to that type of speech when we let ourselves go, when we are purposely speaking freely, jestingly, without serious intent. But it is, then, very essential to notice that such speech is not thereby condemned as wicked without further examination; it is an utterance of which a reasoned account is to be given at the Judgment. If we explore the context farther back, we shall find the difficulty will completely vanish. The Pharisees had been affirming that Jesus cast out devils by the Prince of devils, and Jesus had said that if such a judgment was only directed against Himself personally, it was forgivable; but if it meant that they were going to judge anything to be good or evil, not by its manifestation, but by like or dislike of the agent who performed it, then they were in danger of committing the unforgivable sin, because they were confusing darkness and light with personal prejudice. There may have followed in reply some protest that they were not speaking so seriously as that, or Jesus Himself may have felt that He must allow that they were not making a considered judgment; and so He added this saying.

Four points might be made about the idle word.

1. *There is often revealing power in the careless word.* It is only recently that we have come to understand how entirely true this statement is. We can trace this dawn of its meaning, perhaps, first of all in Dr. Glover's comment in his *Jesus of History*: 'The idle word is to condemn a man, not because it is idle, but because, being unstudied, it speaks of his heart, and reveals, unconsciously but plainly, what he *is* in reality.' If we question whether 'condemn' is not too strong, the comment must be confessed to be a welcome illumination. A dazzling light is thrown on its meaning in Freud's *Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, where the unconsidered, unintentional word becomes of tremendous importance because of what it reveals of the unconscious mind. Once again Jesus has expressed in simple, vivid terms what it has taken centuries to discover is a scientific fact.

Sometimes the mere slips that we make in speech, when our words actually misrepresent the

intention we had in our mind, may reveal what is actually struggling for expression. A man will speak of himself as a 'scholar' in a certain subject, when what he meant to say was a 'student'; and he will hurriedly and perhaps with confusion correct himself. But the slip may betray what his real opinion of himself is, which he must yet conceal out of deference to the prevailing idea that one should be modest about one's attainments.

A quite good and unquestionably moral man will often reveal a most unexpected preference for stories which border on the vulgar or the unclean; and this may possibly indicate that underneath all his convictions and professions he has that lack of reverence for the sanctities of sex which is the root of sensual indulgence. Or, again, a favourite and oft-repeated story may play with ideas of cruelty which, when speaking seriously, a man would not tolerate; and this may expose the existence in himself of some unrecognized unconcern for suffering.

2. *The diagnosis may go too far.*—The unconscious may contain a number of different elements: it may consist of things which we have heard or read, and which we have refused to accept; they remain among the lumber of the rejected. It may be mere memory, where things are stored which have perhaps never penetrated consciousness at all, and, just as in insanity, memory will unroll itself beyond control, and these things will find utterance. The value of anything of this showing what is the soul's real desire is not only nil, it is utterly false and misleading. Again, sometimes things will slip from us which are due to what we might call the still unregenerated elements in our natures. No one of us who knows himself, even when he has consciously and consistently reshaped the ambitions, the aims, and the desires of his life, and has really transformed all his values, will be surprised to learn that there linger in the depths of his being certain elements which have never yet yielded to this new direction of the conscious life. It is from this area that there will proceed many of our worst temptations. There will be the stain and strength of past sins still colouring the mind and pestering the will for expression. Anything that reveals the existence of such a state will tell us nothing new, and while it informs us that there is much to be conquered, yet it does not disclose any unsuspected secrets or show that at root the nature is rotten. But sometimes the unconscious may reveal what we repress not because we ourselves dislike it, but because it is not considered polite, or allowable in good society, or

sanctioned by religion. Such things reveal the real state of our hearts, and we have to take stock of the disclosure. Therefore it is wise for us to take account of our off-duty moods, to note the things we say when we are off our guard.

3. *Mere repression of the idle word is useless.*—There are many people who maintain a considerable renown for wisdom by keeping solemnly silent when others are flowing over with talk, who preserve their dignity against betrayal. But we never know these people through and through, and they may lose some valuable opportunities for knowing themselves. It is not even enough to control one's temper, though the expression of certain feelings in speech does tend to give those feelings more possibility of action and even increase their violence, while repression has the opposite effect. Mere control is, however, exhausting, for it leaves feelings internally still struggling for expression.

Nothing more is accomplished by going in dread of the Judgment Day. That old fear which kept so many tyrants from their worst deeds and kept many a villain within the bounds of ordinary behaviour, while useful socially, is useless individually; because the Judgment Day is to reveal all the hidden hates and secret lusts of the heart. The man who has a passion for holiness and a real hatred for all sin will welcome the premature and unintentional disclosure of what there is in him precisely that he may get rid of it.

4. What has to be sought is a *cleansing which fears no exposure*. We ought to be able to laugh and jest, to join in some boisterous battery of witticism, and find that we had said nothing unseemly, given utterance to nothing that left a wound, revealed nothing, even when our nature was churned up from the bottom, when every form of utterance was left unchecked, of which we have to repent. Thomas à Kempis says somewhere that we often return from company feeling worse than when we

went into it. In a saint this might be due to a feeling of defilement from without; but with most of us the defilement is that which comes from ourselves; and we are miserable merely because we have betrayed ourselves.

What we have to seek is such profound purity of nature, such an overflowing of goodwill, such entire humility, that we can trust ourselves to speak without always keeping a watch upon the door of our lips, that even if we were delirious or lost our rational control, there would be nothing revealed which would condemn us to any right and discerning judgment. No lesser standard will leave us safe.

We shall need for that an inner cleansing. There must be the constant opening of the heart to the gaze and the habitation of God; there must be the welcome within of that cleansing stream which Christ opened on Calvary for all pride and hate, for all false ambition and coward fear. Inmost of all things in our being we must build a shrine for the Holy Ghost. Our most intimate interior companion must be the Christ, from whose radiant, spontaneous, freely flowing goodness we must hope to borrow something by intercourse, communion, and love. There must spring up within us something more than cleansing; a fountain of new life, a radiant holiness, an all-transforming love; for not until the very essence of one's being can freely express itself can we reckon to have attained the glorious liberty of the sons of God. How much prayer and meditation, what discipline and examination, how much seeking of personal union with our Lord there will have to be before this can come to us those who know themselves will dimly guess; but we can all be thankful for this warning given, and we can set ourselves to make it no more needed, but ready to render an account of even the idlest word.¹

¹ W. E. Orchard, *No More War*, 100.

The Purpose of Deuteronomy, Chapter iv.

BY PROFESSOR ADAM C. WELCH, D.D., NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

EVEN a casual reader cannot fail to note the absence of unity in this chapter. Outwardly and inwardly alike there is no cohesion among the fragments which compose it. The narrative passes suddenly and unaccountably from 2nd sing. to 2nd plur. in

the form of address. It whirls the reader from events at Beth-Peor (v.³) to the theophany and the giving of the law at Horeb (v.¹⁰), only to bring him back to East Jordan by inserting a list of asylum towns in that district (v.⁴¹), and to end by an

apparent fresh start in the delivery of the law (v.⁴⁴). These are fragments which have been put together by a collector, not material which has been arranged by an editor. The chapter raises a large question: was the Book of Deuteronomy, as it has reached us, ever really edited in the sense we now apply to that word? And is it not a misleading practice to write about 'editions' of Deuteronomy at all?

There is, however, one block of material which can be separated from the rest, and which ought to be studied in close relation, not to the subjects among which it has been placed, but to ch. 5. This is the reference to certain events at Horeb (vv.¹⁰⁻²⁸), a prevaillingly plural account which has been supplemented by vv.²⁹⁻³⁹, a section in the singular. These last verses softened the threat with which the preceding passage closed, by adding a promise of Divine pardon in the event of the nation's repentance.

Here it is necessary, first, to say something about the sentences in sing. form which occur in the prevaillingly plur. section (vv.¹⁰⁻²⁸). The most important of these is the opening clause in v.¹⁰, which in MT is singular. But all the LXX MSS read, 'ye stood before Yahweh'; and LXX^a continues with 'our God,' LXX^a with 'your God.' MT has been corrupted through a transcriber carrying on the sing. of v.⁹ into the opening clause of the new verse. The trivial mistake brought a more serious confusion after it, for it led to the attempt to join v.¹⁰ to v.⁹, as is done in the RV. The sense which results from forcing the two verses into connexion is rather to seek. When, on the other hand, v.¹⁰ is joined to v.¹¹, the sense is admirable: 'on the day when ye stood before the Lord your (or our) God in Horeb, when the Lord said unto me, Assemble me the people . . . , ye came near and stood under the mountain.' With this situation the little section opens. The writer has one definite message to deliver, that Israel must not worship Yahweh under any visible form. He deduces this from the way in which their God revealed Himself to them on the occasion of the first giving of the law. Accordingly he takes the people back to the event of that primary revelation, selects the features attending this which serve to illustrate what he wishes to say, and then develops his thesis. It will be noted that he follows exactly the method of the author of ch. 5. The narrative is merely the form under which the teaching is conveyed.

There is another case in which the plur. should be restored instead of the sing., the clause with which v.²⁵ opens. For Von Gall's edition of the Samaritan shows that version to have read the

whole verse in the plural. Again, MT has been influenced by the preceding sing. verse. On the other hand, all the versions agree with MT in reading the last clause of v.²³ and all v.²⁴ in the singular. Here the sense combines with the change in number to prove the sentence an addition. For the final clause of v.²³, 'which Yahweh thy God commanded thee,' will not construe after 'and ye make to yourselves an image of the likeness of anything.' The sentence originally closed with 'likeness of anything,' as is the case in v.²⁵. As for v.²⁴, it goes with what precedes and is an otiose addition made up of Ex 24¹⁷ 20⁵. The remaining sing. verse, viz. ¹⁹, is also an addition, but deserves special attention later.

The resemblance between this section, vv.¹⁰⁻²⁸, and ch. 5 is not confined to the fact that both writers use the plural form of address and both cast their teaching into the form of a reference to the story of events at Horeb. They hold the same view of what happened there. Not only do they believe that Yahweh spoke directly to the people out of the mount which was on fire (v.¹²), and that this direct revelation consisted of the Decalogue. They both describe the law in the same terms, calling it the ten *d'bharim* or words, and adding that Yahweh inscribed these on tables of stone (v.¹³). Obedience to these commands will bring it about that Israel shall live long on the earth (v.¹⁰), so that they are not primarily intended for the land to which they go. Yahweh is also said to have commissioned Moses to teach Israel *huggim* and *mishpatim*, i.e. the terms of their positive religion, which, in contrast with the Decalogue, is to be practised in the land which they are about to enter (v.¹⁴). The general attitude of the two writers as to what happened at Horeb is the same, and the likeness extends to their careful use of terms. The only difference is that the author of ch. 5 dwells on the fact of Moses having received authority to lay down the terms of the national religion, while the author of this section merely mentions the commission of Moses in passing. The obvious reason is the different aim of the two sections. In ch. 5 the writer dwells on the character of the two parts of the Mosaic law, Decalogue and Code, and rather presses their difference, because he has it in mind to expound the relation between these two. In ch. 4 the same or another writer only mentions the distinction in passing, because it does not concern his immediate aim. That aim is to insist on the fact that Yahweh must be worshipped without the use of any image.

Steuernagel, however, proposes to cut out the

reference here to Moses' commission by omitting vv.^{13f.}. He calls them an *Abschweifung*, or wandering from the point, because they contain merely an *Erinnerung*, or recollection of the giving of the law. But in this respect the verses are in the same position as the whole section in which they stand; it also recalls the act in which the law was given. In reality Steuernagel has missed the clear distinction both chapters make between the Decalogue and the *huggim* and *mishpatim* which Moses was authorized to issue for his people in Palestine. It is true that he recognizes the *huggim* and *mishpatim* to be the contents of the Code in chs. 12-26. But he is able to say about those last that they relate themselves to the Decalogue as *Thora explicita* to *Thora implicata*. Now the authors of chs. 4 and 5 had a far clearer conception of the relation between Decalogue and Code than their commentator. A mere negative series of mainly ethical laws could never spontaneously and naturally develop into the positive regulations which governed the practice of Israel's religion in Palestine. Regulations about the place of worship, its officials, its festivals, and its offerings, to say nothing of the laws about marriage and war and civil justice, are not implicit in the Decalogue. On the other hand, the command in ch. 4 to avoid all use of images in worship, while it is present in Deut.'s version of the Decalogue, is wholly absent from the Code.

The writer introduced his reference to the covenant in vv.^{13f.} in order to insist on the significance of the events at Horeb. In that great hour Yahweh condescended to speak directly to Israel and to give it the ten words. Then also He instituted the covenant which made Israel what it was, a nation in peculiar relation to Him. From that hour it became the people of Yahweh. And the terms of the covenant-relation were obedience to the Decalogue which Israel had received directly from its God, and obedience to Moses, who was to give the law for Palestine. In connexion with this supreme moment of its history, this creative hour of its national existence, let Israel remember that it saw no outward form. All men witnessed was a voice.

This is the writer's theme: Israel uses no image in its worship of Yahweh. The historical form into which he has cast his teaching is merely the means he employs to mark how fundamental it is. At the time when Israel became the people of Yahweh and received directly from His mouth the revelation of His will, it received all this in such a way as was sufficient to convince it that the use of images in its worship was illegitimate.

But this is a remarkable way of proving or supporting so large a principle. Steuernagel has recognized the novelty of the principle which is here enunciated: 'The emphasis on the invisibility (immateriality, spirituality) of Yahweh is novel over against the older tradition (cf. Ex 24¹⁰, Nu 12⁸), and merely an *argumentum e silentio* from Ex 19, 20^{18f.}.' Whether one must derive it from the chapters in Ex. may be questioned. And to call it a mere argument from silence is hardly quite just. It would perhaps be more accurate to say that to the writer everything which took place at Horeb was normative to the religion of his people. As the covenant relation between Yahweh and Israel, the Decalogue, the commission to Moses constituted the norms of the nation's religious life, so the very method in which Yahweh revealed these things was also regulative of that life. Yet the broad fact remains that the writer must deduce his principle about the rejection of images from a secondary consideration like this. The writer could not and would not have taken this way of deducing a law against the use of images from the mere method in which the revelation was given at Horeb, unless he had no more direct means of enforcing it. The obvious way of deciding so significant a matter was to appeal to the terms of the law itself and to say plainly that Yahweh forbade such worship in the Decalogue which He uttered in the hearing of the people. The only reason why the writer did not do this was that he could not. The Decalogue of his time did not contain the clause which forbade the use of images.

There is another hint in the section which points in the same direction of showing the writer to be conscious that the command against the use of images was no part of his Decalogue, but was rather an inference drawn from the method of the initial revelation. Vv.^{21f.} introduce a statement of how, since Yahweh was angry with Moses on the people's account, the leader was doomed to die in E. Jordan. Formally and in substance the statement agrees with what has already appeared in the historical narrative prefixed to the Code, cf. 13⁷ 32⁶. Here it is employed as the reason for a fresh exhortation to the people to be very careful about keeping the regulation against the use of images. Yet it is remarkable that the exhortation is not enforced, as is the case in so many similar addresses, by an appeal to the 'law which I am delivering to you this day,' or to the 'law which Yahweh your God has commanded that it may be well with you.' The use of images is rather declared to be equivalent to a breach of the covenant (v.²³), and the command

to avoid them is prefaced in v.²⁰ with a statement of how Yahweh chose the nation and brought it out of Egypt. Again, the writer cannot, or at least does not, venture to call the use of images a direct breach of the Decalogue: he can only describe it as the breach of the fundamental conditions which attended the new relation into which Yahweh and Israel had entered. And it is somewhat significant to find the law put into the mouth of Moses immediately before his death. That looks as though the writer were conscious that it was not found either in the Decalogue or in the Code of his day. It stands by itself. He claims for it the authority of Moses, *i.e.* of the prophetic order which has the right to develop and interpret the law of Israel. They have introduced it as a just inference from the whole method which has attended the Divine revelations to their people, and as a necessary means to preserve the purity of the faith which has been committed to their charge.

In an earlier article I pointed out that the natural explanation for the existence of two slightly differing forms of the Decalogue was the same which accounts for the two records of the story of Israel's origins: the two forms derive from the two kingdoms, and the Deuteronomic is from N. Israel. The gravest difficulty which meets us there is to explain how the N. kingdom, if its Decalogue forbade image-worship, could have instituted the official recognition of the calves at Bethel and Dan. Yet it has to be recognized that the only early prophet who attacks the calf-worship derives from the district where this was practised. It was not impossible, therefore, that the clause forbidding the use of images was a later addition to the Decalogue as a result of this prophetic reaction. I now suggest that ch. 4 offers the needed proof. Here is a strong protest against the use of images, which evidently cannot claim the authority of the Horeb Decalogue, and which can only base upon the authority of the circumstances which attended the initial revelation to Israel, and on the authority then given to the prophetic order. The religious leaders of the nation, under the influence of such teaching as Hosea's, are adding a corollary to the Decalogue.

Are there then any reasons, independent of this conclusion, which may help to set a date on the passage? On the one side, it seems clear that, though now appearing in the introductory material, it is really later than the Code. The close relations in language and in idea between this part of ch. 4 and ch. 5 are enough to prove that they belong to the same period and at least derive from the same school. The reasons, therefore, which compel a

date for ch. 5 after the Code apply here also. It must, besides, be noted that the Code has nothing to say about the use of images of Yahweh: while it strictly forbids all heathen emblems, it goes no farther. Had the use of Yahweh-emblems been so strongly forbidden as it is here, its silence on the subject would at least be remarkable. But further, the threat of exile with which the section closes makes it likely that its writer was addressing a generation which was already acquainted with the wholesale transportation of peoples practised by the Assyrians. The section is later than the Code.

On the other hand, the passage cannot be post-exilic. Steuernagel has already recognized this, because, he says, there is no appearance of the threat it contains being a *vaticinium post eventum*. A more convincing proof can be found in the fact that even the section vv.²⁹⁻³⁹, which has been added to the original threat in order to promise the Divine mercy in the event of Israel's repentance has not a word to say about a Return. Now the post-exilic men could not conceive that they were restored to the Divine mercy, unless they were also restored to the Temple. Naturally so, for the effect of the Josianic reform had been to make the sacrificial system at Jerusalem essential to the maintenance of the covenant-relation between Yahweh and Israel. They could not conceive themselves restored to the Divine mercy without this essential means of grace.

Steuernagel is content to place the threat before the close of the Exile. But that does not meet the difficulty of explaining why the later promise of mercy ignores a Return. Besides, one must ask for some evidence of the existence of any body of religious authorities during the Exile who could issue such a remarkable law as this, and one must ask to whom it was supposed to be addressed, or whether it was a kind of manifesto issued *in vacuo*. In addition, however, there is no sufficient reason for bringing the section so late as the Exile. Men in N. Israel, even before Samaria fell, could use such a threat, because the people had already seen some of their neighbours and even some of their own E. districts harried and depopulated by the invaders. And religious men, who were forbidding a practice against which Hosea protested, could naturally use his threat against a disloyal nation. For this prophet had declared that Yahweh, in His anger against Israel, would expel it from Palestine, that home to which He brought His bride. The threat of expulsion from Canaan is the leading threat Hosea employed. The sin ch. 4 forbids is

the sin against which he protested. Both elements of the chapter have the same source.

Again, vv.²⁹⁻³⁹, the section of restoration to the Divine mercy, have a remarkably individual note. They are not made up of the stereotyped phrases which appear frequently in the exilic and post-exilic passages of the same character. The affinities which they reveal, both in language and idea, are rather to the series of oracles which Jeremiah in cc. 3-5 addressed to his fellow-countrymen in Ephraim. The little address was added after the collapse of Samaria, in order to hearten the remnant Israelites, who needed all the succour a prophetic message could bring them.

The same hand added v.¹⁹, the other verse in 2nd sing. which appears in the plur. section. That this has been added is clear on other grounds than the change in the form of address. The rest of the passage insists, as has been said, on one theme,

that men must make no emblem of Yahweh and employ no image in connexion with His worship. Now a warning against the worship of sun, moon, and stars is obviously out of place in this demand. Apart from the fact that men could not make the celestial bodies as they made images, these are spoken of as though they were worshipped directly, not introduced as emblems of anything. To worship them had nothing to do with image-worship; it was an offence against the primary demand of the Decalogue, that Israel shall acknowledge no other god but Yahweh. The verse is an addition which dates from the same period to which vv.²⁹⁻³⁹ have been assigned, the period when N. Israel was living alongside heathen settlers who practised the astral cults of the Assyrians. Recognizing that the law said nothing about such a danger, recognizing perhaps that the Code also ignored it, the religious leaders of the people inserted this solemn word of warning.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY THE REVEREND J. W. JACK, M.A., GLENFARG, PERTHSHIRE.

BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY is that branch of knowledge which takes cognizance of the past civilizations which have moulded Biblical history, and investigates them by means of the remains of art, architecture, monuments, inscriptions, literature, language, implements, customs, and all other examples which have survived. Without such knowledge it is impossible to understand properly the background of the Biblical records and the problems that confronted the Israelite world. Every scrap of knowledge of ancient life in Bible lands serves to make the Biblical narrative much more vivid, and enables the message of revelation to be transmitted with greater efficiency. Thanks to our excavators and explorers in Palestine and neighbouring lands, facts are being brought to light which are giving us truer conceptions of ancient history and putting it on a more trustworthy basis.

In addition to the work which is being carried on at numerous sites, several societies are developing far-reaching plans for the future. Their projects may open up vistas of history hitherto undreamed of. The Palestine Exploration Fund has mean-

time resolved to proceed no further with the excavation of the hill Ophel at Jerusalem, although the important work there will probably be resumed some day. It has arranged instead, in conjunction with Harvard University, the British School of Archæology in Jerusalem, the British Academy, and the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, to undertake a new intensive excavation, extending over three years, of the famous site of Samaria, which yielded such valuable information (including Hebrew *ostraca*) under Dr. Reisner over twenty years ago. The work, which will be under the direction of Mr. J. W. Crowfoot, assisted by Dr. Sukenik of the Hebrew University, will probably begin in March or April of this year. Sir Flinders Petrie, along with a large party of experts, has undertaken this winter to excavate the large Hyksos camp at *Tell Ajjul*, a few miles south of Gaza, in an effort to fill in the gap of, roughly, a thousand years in the history of Palestine from the neolithic age onwards. Close by, at Gerar (now *Tell Jemmeh*), where Abraham and Isaac lived, he is also to carry out digging operations, in the hope of unearthing relics of those patriarchs. The Oriental

Institute of Chicago, under Professor J. H. Breasted as director, which has been excavating for several years at Megiddo (*Tell el-Mutesellim*), has now bought important ground there and on the adjacent Mount Carmel for archaeological exploration. Deep down in this ancient *Tell*, in stratum upon stratum, lie the streets and buildings of older walled-in cities, without doubt containing important monuments and records going back over five thousand years. The excavation promises to be one of the most scientific and elaborate ever conducted in the Near East. A sign of the advancing times is that a Chair of Archaeology has recently been founded at the American University of Beirut, so that natives in that region will be able to collaborate with Europeans and Americans in the discovery and interpretation of the different civilizations that succeeded each other in Palestine.

Work has begun at last on the site of Tanis (Biblical Zoan) in the Egyptian Delta, with the assistance of a grant from the French Government. Here M. Pierre Montet, the celebrated French archaeologist, the excavator of Byblos, has unearthed, among numerous other valuable fragments, six granite columns, twenty-three feet high, inscribed with hieroglyphs. The inscriptions prove, he holds, that the city was identical with Raamses or Pi-Ramasse (the famous residence of Ramesses II. in the Delta), from which the Israelite host set out on its flight from Egypt (Ex 12²⁷). His argument lies in the fact that they speak of Ramesses II. as having the protection of 'Amon, Seth, Horus, and Ptah of Ramesses.' Usually in such lists of deities, the place where each is worshipped is added, such as Amon of Karnak, Ptah of Memphis, and so on. Here, however, in Tanis, Ramesses has appropriated these divinities to himself; and Montet points out that the only case in which a similar list occurs is in the texts connected with the city of Pi-Ramasse. Scholars have differed as to the site of this city, some placing it much farther to the south, and others (such as Gardiner, Peet, and Hall) at Pelusium, on the north-east coast. If M. Montet's view be correct, the 'Red (or Reedy) Sea' would correspond with the south-eastern portion of Lake Manzala, and many difficulties would be explained. But additional evidence will be required for such a view, which was at one time held by Brugsch and then abandoned by him, and which seems to conflict with the site of Pithom, which is believed by most experts to have been discovered by Naville at *Tell el-Maskûta*, in the Wady Tumîlât. At all events, the position of Tanis on the Nile, in or near to what was the land of Goshen, marks it out as a

residence of the Pharaohs, and a probable dwelling-place of the Hebrews in bondage. So far, only the gateway of the main temple and the ruins of the temple of Anta, 230 metres distant, have been uncovered, but the further excavation of the whole site will doubtless throw much light on these debatable matters.

Occasionally Old Testament texts or statements receive wonderful confirmation or illumination. The passage, for instance, in Ezekiel (23^{14f.}), describing figures of men portrayed in vermilion on the Babylonian palace walls, has been singularly illustrated by the mural paintings recently discovered at Til-Barsib (modern *Tell Ahmar*), on the Euphrates, by Maurice Dunand and Thureau-Dangin. The whole palace has been found to be decorated on the inside walls with pictures about six feet high. Altogether over fifty yards of these have been discovered, and are believed to date from the reign of Tiglath-pileser (745 B.C.). Copies of them, executed on the scale of the original, are being placed in the Assyrian department of the Louvre. The scenes portrayed are various—groups of disarmed rebels, the king with an escort of lords and nobles ('all of them princes to look upon'), galloping horsemen, wild animals, and similar representations. The vermilion colour still remains solid and adherent, while the other colours (black, white, and blue) have fallen away in many places. Ezekiel, of course, was referring to 'Chaldean' (Babylonian) palaces. By the time he wrote (592 B.C.) the Assyrian palaces had been put to the flames. Nevertheless, the discoveries at Til-Barsib afford sufficient evidence of what must have existed in Babylonia also.

Since our last review, further excavations have been reported from Palestine. The ancient town of Kiriath-sepher or Debir (*Tell Beit Mirsim*) exhibits ten different strata, separated from each other by remains of conflagration. As one of the strata (the third from the top) has also a burned level in the midst of it, it follows that this home of scribes or books was destroyed at least eleven times by fire. The lowest stratum goes back to the First Bronze Age (over 2000 B.C.). Some remarkable finds have been secured. Most interesting of all, perhaps, is a complete set of game pieces, discovered in the ruins of the palace (dating from about 1700 B.C.). The ten pieces of the game, consisting of five little three-cornered pyramids and five little cones, all of faience, together with the ivory die which was used to determine moves, have all been found, though the game-board itself is unfortunately missing. A number of *ostraca*, dating from

800-600 B.C., and bearing some incised names, have also been discovered. All are broken, but the names Gera, Nahum, and Hezekiah seem probable. Latest reports from *Tell Rumeileh* (Beth-shemesh), west of Jerusalem, where Professor Elihu Grant, of Haverford College, Pennsylvania, has been at work with a new expedition, show that the main racial features of the city were probably Canaanite to the last. Its successive conquerors, whether Egyptian, Philistine, or Israelite, provided the masters, but such people never formed the chief part of the population. It was an important centre in the latter part of the second millennium. It was here that the ark rested by a great stone in the days of Samuel, and it was one of the chief places in Solomon's province of Dan. But after the schism in the monarchy, it appears to have declined, and its poorest age has been found to be the one under the kings of Judah, from 900-700 B.C. (or later), when the population lived near the rim of the city, close to or over the remains of the old wall. At *Râmet el-Khalîl* ('The home of Abraham'), believed by some scholars to be Mamre, two miles north of Hebron, where A. E. Mader has been excavating, potsherds which can be dated some time between the ninth and sixth centuries B.C., as well as fragments supposed to belong to the First Bronze Age, have been found. At the *Teleilat* (Tells of) *Ghassûl*, in the eastern valley of the Jordan, some four miles north of the Dead Sea, Père A. Mallon has laid bare part of a prehistoric city, which appears to have been destroyed by an immense conflagration some time before 2000 B.C., and never rebuilt. The remains point to a developed and even luxurious civilization, with rectangular houses, extraordinarily uniform, constructed of stone and hand-shaped bricks (the impressions of the fingers being still visible), and with a remarkable knowledge at that early date of agriculture and ceramics. Further and more careful consideration, however, of the discoveries at these two last-mentioned places is desirable before satisfactory conclusions can be drawn. Many of the deductions put forward by Mader from his excavations at *Râmet el-Khalîl*, especially in regard to the existence of a sanctuary of Abraham and a

via sacra leading up to it, have been shown by Dupont-Sommer and other archæologists to have little or no foundation; and the idea of Père Mallon that *Teleilat Ghassûl* is probably Sodom can hardly be accepted, as evidence is against the valley to the north of the Dead Sea being the site of the Pentapolis, and in any city of the time of Abraham there would probably be more signs of metal.

The statement made in our last article that the inhabitants of Palestine were in possession of alphabetic writing long before the days of Joshua has been confirmed by the discovery at Gezer of an inscribed *ostrakon* containing three letters in a very archaic script, older still than that on the Beth-shemesh fragment to which we referred. The sherd was found by the American School on the section of the hill where Macalister located the high altar. The script is well executed, having been made by a sharp instrument before the clay was baked. When it was shown to Professor Butin, fresh from his search for new inscriptions at Serâbît, he was struck by the similarity of the letters to the Proto-Sinaitic ones (believed by many scholars to be the parent of the Phœnician) and read them כ"י. This led of necessity to the question of age, and the sherd was submitted to three experts in Palestinian pottery: Père Vincent, Professor Garstang, and Dr. Fisher. Each of them, without hesitation, and without knowing the opinion of the others, pronounced it to belong to the Middle Bronze Age (2000-1600 B.C.). The lettering is thus the oldest yet discovered in Palestine, and its importance will occur immediately to all students of Semitic epigraphy. It gives us every reason to believe that such a script, whether Proto-Sinaitic or Phœnician, was known and used in Palestine long before the time of the Hebrew conquest. That the Hebrews themselves, during their sojourn in Egypt, were acquainted with writing, probably in the same Semitic characters, is evident from certain of their number being appointed *shatar*, 'officers' (Ex 5¹⁴ J), a word which literally means 'scribes' (cf. Assyrian, *shafâru*, 'write'; Aram., *shefârâ*, 'document'). This implies that the Hebrews kept the usual registering and account work which the Egyptian taskmasters required.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Studies of Luther.

THIS collection of essays¹ by Catholic as well as Protestant writers, which has been brought together by the editor, a man devoted to the cause of Christian Reunion, presents Luther from varying standpoints in varied aspects. It proves how strong the influence and how great the authority of Luther in his own native land still are, so that the reunion movement must seek a justification in his name; but also that Germany is not so exclusively dominated by Lutheranism, which often is a much smaller thing than Luther himself, as to exclude the wider vision of an œcumenical Christianity, in which the oppositions brought about by the Reformation might be reconciled. That Roman Catholics should under their own name write as they do about 'the heretic' shows that they claim a larger liberty, or are allowed a greater independence than their Church in other lands usually admits. That Catholic and Protestant writers should co-operate in such an enterprise shows the mutual desire for understanding and fellowship. To put the object of the essays briefly, it is to show how much Luther owed to existing Catholicism, how Catholic he remained, how much he desired to reform the Church from within, and not to form a church outside of it, and how desirable and possible it is to tread, following in his footsteps, the path that will lead to the recovery of the unity of the Church. A confirmation of this hope is sought in showing that some Roman Catholic writers on Luther have been seeking to do him justice, and not to treat him with prejudice, as formerly was the case. Besides the Introduction by the editor, and the notice of two books on Luther (Grisar and Buonaiuti), there are nineteen essays by many authors, from the tone of which it would for the most part be difficult to infer from which camp they come. It would be quite impossible within the necessary limits of such a notice to discuss the contents in detail. The two writers best known in this country are Archbishop Söderblom, who writes on *Luther in the Light of Œcumenicity*, and F. Heiler, a convert from Roman Catholicism to Lutheranism, whom many orthodox Lutherans regard as not soundly con-

verted, who writes on *Luther's Significance for the Christian Churches*, which is the longest and in some respects the most important of the essays. The conclusion of the Archbishop's article is, that we dare not now be less œcumenical and catholic in our conception of the Holy Church than was Luther (p. 68). Heiler affirms that Luther belongs to the whole Church of Christ; and that, many as may have been his errors, history will yet justify his own humble but confident estimate of his own work: 'I know that God at the last day will bear me witness that I have preached aright' (p. 186). Mention may be made of some of the articles to indicate the wide range of interest of the volume. Müller proves very clearly how much Luther was indebted not only to Augustine himself, but also to the Augustinian tradition which persisted through the Middle Ages; and Dyrssen discusses his relation to the current Christian philosophy. Albani and Sommer discuss kindred questions under the titles: 'Did Luther break with the Church? Did the Church break with Luther?' and 'Was Luther a destroyer of the unity of the Church or a pioneer?' Albani defends Luther against the charge of Subjectivism; and Hansen confirms this defence by his discussions of Luther's relation to the 'enthusiastic sects' (*Schwärmgeister*). Fisher shows what Luther at prayer has to teach the whole of Christendom; and Bigelmair describes his relation to German mysticism. Defensive essays are Glintz's *Luther as an Œcumenical Magnitude* (Grösse), Hackl's *Luther's Evangelism*, Sinz's *The Eternal Significance of the Reformation*, and Wallan's *The Œcumenical Right of the Evangelical Protest*. These must suffice. The editor's description of this collection of essays may be quoted. 'It refrains from the desire already now to find an objective basis, on which Christians of the separated confessions can meet together. It only winds a series of individual utterances into a garland, each of which does not claim to be any more than an expression of personal conviction with personal responsibility. Yet an unseen (but felt) band nevertheless binds them to one another; what stretches out a brotherly hand is a chain of 'men who are of one good will.' And with the good will it must begin, if we desire to come to reconciliation 'that surely must be the first thing' (p. 9). Because I believe that it is a gain for British Christians to know Luther better, especially in the aspects which do not appear in popular

¹ *Luther in Œcumenischer Sicht von Evangelischen und Katholischen Mitarbeitern herausgegeben*, von Alfred v. Martin. Fr. Frohmanns Verlag (H. Kurtz), Stuttgart, 1929.

Protestant literature, and because I believe, despite all difficulties and disappointments, in the unity of the Church of Christ, and the consequent duty of reunion, I do most heartily recommend this valuable volume.

A Revealing Record.

I HAD the pleasure of having the author of this autobiography¹ as my guest, when he was attending a Conference on Public Morals in London in 1922; but it is not my personal interest which alone prompts me to call the attention of the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES to this volume of varied interest and great value. The life record is itself attractive; and it is presented in an admirable order. The First Part deals with the influences of inheritance and environment: on his mother's side there was a Huguenot-religious influence, on his father's, a professor of history, a national-liberal, and he ascribes to these the permanent duality of his nature and life; very candidly and yet with restraint he indicates a tension in experience and character between his two parents, and his closer intimacy with his mother.

In the Second Part he deals with cultural and educational influences: the gymnasium, sport and comradeship, intercourse with the heir to the throne of Baden, formation of his character by his environment in Alsace, to which his family removed on his father's appointment at the newly founded University of Strasbourg in 1872, his resolve to study theology, due to an inner constraint to preach the gospel to the circles to which he belonged (p. 36) despite opposing influences in his surroundings, a period of retirement from activity on account of a failure of health, military service, course of study, entrance into the ministry—are all so described as to become a disclosure of his personality. Owing to difficulties in finding a suitable sphere of labour, he felt drawn, although with great reluctance, and contrary to his mother's, but in accord with his father's wishes, to turn to an academic career (p. 79). 'The change from the ministerial to the academic calling was inwardly so difficult, because I had no intense scholarly need or interest, and had little pleasure in reading learned works.' What, however, made the transition less violent was that he was the Professor of Practical Theology

(as *extraordinary* at Jena, and for thirty-two years as *ordinary* at Kiel).

In the Third Part he describes his experiences in the academic world. He remained, however, a preacher and a worker in many ways; and accordingly he devotes the Fourth Part to his experiences in Church life, in which the dominating interest was to preserve what he describes as 'evangelical freedom.' One of his practical interests was in religious education in the public schools, and he deals with his efforts and controversies in this sphere in the Fifth Part. One of the most interesting parts is the Sixth, concerned with his experiences in political life. The Seventh Part records his reactions as preserved in a monthly Chronicle which he wrote during the world-war; and the Eighth Part deals with post-war occurrences.

The account he gives of his courtship, marriage, all too brief home happiness, the death of his wife with the baby son, is deeply moving. What for us is of special interest is the fact that, as she was partly English, he has been brought into closer relation to our land, has a better understanding and a warmer affection for our people than 'his countrymen generally can have; and this made the war all the more tragic an experience for him. Despite these wider sympathies, he remains typically German. Belonging to the cultured and the ruling class, he had no faith in democracy as a political method; and yet was keen on social reform; his ideas were akin to those of Plato, that it were best to entrust rule to the few wise. For the Emperor William's autocracy he always had an aversion. Action which he took in the strike of Hamburg dockers brought on him official censure, and the imperial displeasure shown in a public insult and in hindrance of his advancement in his academic career (p. 225). What will surprise many readers is the enthusiasm he shows for compulsory military service, the defence he offers of war, not only defensive, but even offensive if the nation's need of expansion demands it, and his exclusion of the authority of the teaching of Jesus from the sphere of politics and economics. Carried away by his patriotism to approve even the most ruthless methods of warfare, such as the submarine attacks on merchant ships, he nevertheless betrayed in some respects a moderation which provoked antagonism among his countrymen; he tried to do justice to the British motives, and was opposed to the extreme proposals of conquest which were made when it seemed as if Germany might be victor. Himself distinctly evangelical in doctrine, he contended for absolute freedom not only for teachers

¹ Otto Baumgarten: *Meine Lebensgeschichte*. Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck). Tübingen, 1929.

of theology but even for preachers. Wide in his social sympathies, and active in social reform, his class-consciousness appeared in his insistence that the education in the schools for the people should be adapted to their station, and his opposition to the aspirations of the teachers in these schools for a more liberal culture, as likely to remove them too far from those whom they taught. He qualified this attitude by maintaining that the value of personality does not depend on intellectual equipment. Of an intensely religious disposition, and of high and large moral standards, he for many years exercised a great influence as a preacher; his conception of the pastoral office was elevated, and the training for it, which he had as Professor of Pastoral Theology aimed at imparting, exacting. To him life has always meant much more than learning, and he has not been the German professor as usually imagined.

The parts of the volume dealing with war and post-war experiences will for English readers have most, if largely very painful, interest. In the mirror of the sensitive, passionate, patriotic, and yet Christian soul we can see ourselves as we as a nation in our policy during and after the war appeared. Some of the charges we are justified in denying; the truth of others we must sorrowfully confess. The situation of Germany since the war has brought about what may without exaggeration be described as an inner revolution in the author. This change he frankly confesses. 'He who looks back from this enthusiastic proclamation of peace among the nations and world-feeling on my politics, so long and warmly advocated, determined by nationalist and militarist considerations, of self-assertive and forceful striving, he can measure how the great occurrences of the time have affected my innermost soul, and have compelled me to unlearn in the most essential questions' (p. 500). He has become a supporter of the World Alliance for International Friendship, an advocate and defender of the League of Nations, a democrat and a republican. He pleads, however, and justifies his plea, that he is no opportunist, but a realist, and Christian realist, who has followed the guidance of God in the course of events as showing God's will for mankind.

While the biographical interest is the dominant, yet so many-sided has his life been, so manifold his interests, activities, and relationships, that the volume brings seventy years' history of Germany before us in all its varied aspects, gives us an insight into the thought and life of that people which should correct our prejudices, and secure our

sympathies, as we witness the rise and the fall of a great Empire, and, let it be added, at least the beginnings of the nation's resurrection to, one may hope, a worthier destiny.

The author is led in this record of his life to deal with economic, social, educational, cultural, political, moral, and ecclesiastical problems, indeed 'nothing human seems alien to him'; but what runs like a golden thread through the complex pattern of the story is that it is a wide-visioned, large-hearted, courageous, and forceful Christian personality who thinks, suffers, and labours; in a word, lives intensely in seeking their solution. There is a distinctively theological interest also, although the author confesses that the academic career had less attraction for him than the practical ministry; yet it is interesting to trace the reaction on his liberal evangelical theology of outward occurrences and inward experiences. The volume is, therefore, a contribution to theology as well as to religion and morals, and can be most cordially commended.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

London.

Varia.

DR. FISCHER'S discussion¹ of the nature of the text which lay before the LXX translators of Isaiah is in part a polemic against Wutz's theory that that text was a Greek transcription of the Hebrew letters, and in part a reply to Sperber's strictures on a previous discussion of his on the text that underlies the LXX translation of the Pentateuch. Every chapter of Isaiah is examined for the linguistic evidence with the most scrupulous care, and the result, according to Fischer, is an overwhelming refutation of Wutz's hypothesis. Without any doubt, he maintains, the basis of the LXX of Isaiah was the Hebrew consonantal text, and not a transcription of that text in Greek letters. Some of the translator's mistakes, for example, are due to a manifest confusion between *Hebrew* consonants, such as ך and ך. The translator knew Aramaic better than Hebrew—his defective knowledge of Hebrew explains his omission of an occasional word or words—and the alphabet of his text was a neo-Aramaic alphabet which approximated to the Hebrew square writing. The translation was executed between 250 and 201 B.C., and, as against the late Professor Gray, he argues from the fact

¹ *In Welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaías den LXX vor?* Eine textkritische Studie von Johann Fischer (Töpelmann, Giessen. M.6).

that עֲבֹדָה appears *throughout* as Σαβωθ, that the translation is a unity, and not to be divided between two authors. Some of the results are of first-rate importance for exegesis. For example in 1¹³, where most scholars believe that צֶם, to which *ἡγεσθαι* points, is original, Fischer maintains that מֶם is the original, out of which צֶם grew by a confusion and combination of the consonants. (Against this, however, seems to be the intentional assonance of צֶם and עֲצֶרָה.)

In an exhaustive examination¹ of Dn 3 which is abundantly illustrated by analogies drawn from the folk-lore of the world, Dr. Kuhl shows himself a true disciple of Gunkel. He displays much of that great scholar's skill in the analysis and appreciation of legend. According to Kuhl, Dn 3 is an isolated narrative which has no real connexion with the other narratives in the book. It is the Persian period, not the Babylonian, which the narrative reflects, and it probably originated towards the end of that period. Though it preserves a few historical traits, its historical value as a narrative is 'extremely small.' Its chief feature is 'the miraculous deliverance,' and it is just there,

¹ *Die Drei Männer im Feuer* (ein Beitrag zur israelitisch-jüdischen Literaturgeschichte), von Curt Kuhl (Töpelmann, Giessen. M. 10).

as Kuhl bluntly puts it, 'that the unhistorical character of the whole is revealed.' It is not the fact, but the wish, that inspires and creates such a story. As the story is not a product of Maccabean times, neither is Nebuchadnezzar meant to represent Antiochus Epiphanes, to whom indeed he bears no resemblance. The writer, though he knows how to strain our curiosity, is not, on the whole, a first-rate story-teller. This tale was originally told in Hebrew—probably also all the other Aramaic tales. A very valuable part of the book is the discussion of the ordeal by fire and the 'three men' *motif*, amply illustrated from a wide range of literature. Careful attention is given to the LXX additions, which are examined in detail and retranslated into Hebrew—the prayer of Azariah, and the hymn of the three men in the fire; and the conclusion is reached that these additions do not correspond to the assumed circumstances, they have nothing to do with Dn 3, and behind them lies a Hebrew original. The whole discussion is extraordinarily interesting: it is a notable contribution to the literature of legend in general and of the Book of Daniel in particular. On p. 43, line 1, 'fester' should be corrected to 'festen,' and on p. 107, line 27, 'irrisistible' to 'irresistible.'

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Glasgow.

Entre Nous.

For the Children.

The Rev. Edward Vernon, M.A., has a gift which is rare. He can speak supremely well to children. So we welcome *Before We Grow Up*: 'Stories from Everyday for Children and Speakers to Children,' which have been retold from 'The British Weekly' (Allenson; 3s. 6d. net). They are real children, and every story has a moral; and what more can you want? Here is number three, 'Tomboy the Climber.'

'They shall be afraid of that which is high.'—Eccles xii. 5.

'Tomboy had disappeared. Not that anyone worried very much about that, for you could always be sure that Tomboy would turn up all right in time for meals, a little dirtier perhaps, very untidy, very hungry, but always smiling. But no one ever

knew where Tomboy had been, and no one ever asked. Once, a sheet of writing-paper had been discovered near the riverside covered with large writing beginning, "My dere birds," and ending with "Your luvving Tomboy." But that was the only time it was ever discovered where Tomboy had been.

'Tomboy was for ever writing letters to strange people. The spelling wasn't always as correct as it should have been, but then, as Tomboy said, "It's a silly thing to have only one way of spelling a word. What does it matter how you spell it if you know the thing?" Which, of course, is quite true. It's more important to know and to love flowers than always to be able to spell f-l-o-w-e-r. Tomboy knew flowers far better than many of those who can spell them. Tomboy once planted some

in a part of the garden, and then wrote a big notice and put it on a stick, "DOWNT TUCH FLOWWS," because that was the way it sounded when people said it in London. Whatever way flowers should be spelt on paper, they were spelt correctly in Tomboy's heart.

'So no one worried very much where Tomboy had got to, except perhaps Rosemary, who had no one to play with. Tom and Andy were in the workshop making a fishing-rod. They were just taking it out to the river to try it, when something white fluttered down from a tall tree under which they were passing. Tom looked up quickly, and spied the missing Tomboy seated far up in the branches, with a pencil and mummy's writing-pad.

"Don't touch that paper," shouted Tomboy from aloft, when there was no longer any use in keeping the hiding-place secret.

"I will," shouted back Andy. "Come on, Tom, let's read this and see what the kid has been writing."

'There were shouts and cries from the top of the tree, but all in vain, and by the time Tomboy returned to the house, feeling very shy, every one had read the letter. This, of course, was a great shame, for letters are your very own and private. No one should read other people's letters, for that is just like eavesdropping, which, of course, only mean people do. Besides, the letters might be about yourself, and they might not be saying nice things. Post cards, of course, are quite a different matter. But here is the letter :

"dere all other boys and girls i am tomboy and i am biggern you all becos i am rit at the top of a big tree the branshes is rokking something offle so the groanups wood be fritinned i luv climing its best to be hi so ile tell you how to clime you must not allow your self to be fritinned like the groanups is if you get fritinned you must luke up doant luke down or yule foll your cloze gets green but it rubs off if it duzzint you have to howld your hand over it when you get hom or theyl see it too soon you must take a good hold with one hand beforr you let go with the uther with luv tomboy."

'Now, some mummies would have laughed at this letter and scolded for climbing trees and tearing clothes, but Tomboy's mummy knew better. She said she loved the courage of the hand that wrote it, even though the spelling was so bad ; and she put it away in a drawer where only special things were kept. She told Tomboy it was fine never to let yourself get frightened of what was high. "But there are other high things besides trees," she said, "and I would like to think that my Tomboy was

always climbing the best things. Not content to be just ordinary good and true and brave, and not afraid to climb every day to be better and braver and truer than you had ever been before. Most people are frightened to try to climb very high."

"Yes," said daddy, "the Bible says that we 'groanups' get afraid of that which is high as we grow older just as you said, and when we get frightened we look down instead of looking up to where God is. And we often let go of Him with one hand before we've got a hold with another."

'I think Tomboy understood, for the little head was held high, and the steady eyes that were blue as the skies to which they looked never faltered downwards. They said, as plainly as could be, "i luv climing and its best to be hi."

The children have had a story, now here is a poem for them. It was written by Cecil Frances Alexander, the wife of William Alexander, Primate of all Ireland. It is quoted from *Selected Poems* of William Alexander, Archbishop of Armagh, 1896-1911, and Cecil Frances Alexander (S.P.C.K. ; 3s. 6d. net). The selection includes Mrs. Alexander's best-known hymns—'Once in royal David's city' ; 'We are but little children weak' ; 'Jesus calls us o'er the tumult' ; and 'There is a green hill far away.' Extracts are given from the preface to her complete works written by her husband. He says : 'When her work was once done she did not trouble herself much about its fate. Many of her noblest hymns were written for one particular occasion, used once only, and perhaps never thought of again by her. Many lovely poems were written to please a friend or to soothe a sorrower. To applause she was more utterly deaf than anyone I have ever met. Recently some good man (I think an English Nonconformist minister) sent me a tract. It contained a history (for whose truth the writer vouched) of a great change in the heart and life of a very worldly man. He happened to hear the hymn "There is a green hill far away" very exquisitely sung. That became the fountain of a new feeling, the starting-point of a new life. Mrs. Alexander almost sprang from her chair and said : "Thank God ! I do like to hear that."

Here is the poem for the children :

TWO WAYS.

A wasp and bee together
Went out on silver wings,
With black and yellow bodies,
And both of them had stings.

Bee sucked the golden honey
 Out of a tulip cup,
 And when her thighs were laden
 Went home to store it up.

Wasp got into a cherry
 And stung a little boy
 Who snatched the rosy berry,
 And then flew off with joy.
 O boys and little maidens,
 Be you still good and kind ;
 Better to store up honey
 Than leave a sting behind.

Booth-Tucker: Sadhu and Saint.

In 1853 there was born in Bengal Frederick St. George De Loutour Tucker. He came of 'a family famous alike for courage and capacity.' His father was in the Bengal Civil Service, and he himself passed into the Indian Civil Service, and had won some promotion there when he volunteered for work with the Salvation Army and embraced a life of poverty and discipline. In 1882 he was allowed by old General Booth to return to India as head of a small band of four Salvationists. In nine years' time the four had become four hundred and seventy-nine. The one station that they began with in Bombay had become one hundred and twenty-three. Converts who were enrolled soldiers were nearly four thousand. No band of missionaries had ever got hold of the people in this way. He reached them by coming to them in Indian guise. He adopted native dress, ate native food, and even begged from door to door and walked barefoot—the white fakir. 'I must cross the line to find where the line is,' he answered people who taxed him with going too far, 'but I never ask others to do what I myself have not already done.' Frederick Tucker married one of General Booth's daughters, Emma Moss Booth, and then changed his name by deed pole to Booth-Tucker. He died in July 1928, and his life has been written by Mr. F. A. Mackenzie—*Booth-Tucker: Sadhu and Saint* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). There is a preface by General Higgins of which we quote the last words: 'Said one of the most distinguished of his early colleagues in Government service in India, after Commissioner Booth-Tucker's death: "He came the nearest in spirit and conduct to his divine Lord and Master of any I have known."'

Paterson of Hebron.

In *Paterson of Hebron* the Rev. W. Ewing, M.C., D.D., has been at great pains to narrate fully the

notable career of the only survivor of that great generation of medical missionaries in Syria and Palestine that included Dr. Percy Wheeler, Dr. F. I. Mackinnon, Dr. Vartan, and Dr. D. W. Torrance (James Clarke; 8s. 6d. net). Dr. Ewing writes with intimate knowledge of Palestine and the East. It was no fault of his that he has had to make this impressive narrative a protest against what he regards as the unjustifiable action of a Commission of the former United Free Church of Scotland in its treatment of Dr. Paterson and a vindication of thirty years of devoted service. We think the majority of readers will agree with the Very Rev. Dr. Adam Philip, a former Moderator of the Church, that 'henceforth the Hebron Doctor will stand where he should, high in the pride of his countrymen, and in the affection of those everywhere who are watching with wonder the march of the Christian enterprise.' A native of the parish of Kilmany in East Fifeshire, the grandfather of Dr. Paterson was the intimate friend of the future Dr. Chalmers. Dr. Paterson began his real life-work at Hebron, which claims to be the oldest city in Palestine, situated twenty-one miles beyond Jerusalem among the uplands of Judea and more than three thousand feet above the sea. Here among a most fanatical people the young medical missionary opened his clinique, which at once attracted great numbers from the town and surrounding villages. Despite the difficulties of dealing with the official Turks, his patience, perseverance, firmness, courage, and courtesy never failed. For the first ten years of his work the want of a hospital was keenly felt. Negotiations were opened with the Jewish Committee of the United Free Church of Scotland. An offer of £5300 by Mr. Martineau, a brother of the famous Dr. Martineau, to build a hospital at Hebron to be under Dr. Paterson's management was accepted. It had not been easy to win an entrance to the citadel of Muslim fanaticism and Jewish mistrust which Hebron was, but now a great opportunity was granted him. But the outbreak of the War and the domination of Turkey by the Germans suddenly changed the whole position. Dr. Paterson had to seek safety in flight. He took service with the British Army, re-entered Palestine with Lord Allenby's expeditionary force, and on his return to Hebron was welcomed by its inhabitants. He was most enthusiastic in his desire to complete the building of the hospital, but the Committee of the General Assembly and the Assembly itself did not see their way to support him, hence his resignation and the close of his career as a medical missionary. 'He lived for the work, and it was his

unshakable conviction that no other could make life so well worth living.'

Wanderings in Widest Africa.

In *Wanderings in Widest Africa*, by Mr. Dugald Campbell, F.R.G.S. (R.T.S. ; 7s. 6d. net), we have another long narrative from one whom the Rev. Dr. G. A. Frank Knight describes as having perhaps explored more of Darkest Africa than any other living man. He is called a missionary colporteur. As the agent of the National Bible Society of Scotland it was agreed that he should proceed to the neglected and needy parts of the Sahara and carry on there for two years the circulation of the Scriptures in Arabic, French, and selected portions in various native dialects. He landed in the French territory of Mauretania on the West Coast of Africa, proceeded up the Senegal river, passed thence to the upper waters of the Niger, and then east along that great river as far as 'Timbuctoo the Mysterious.' He made long detours into the Sahara, returning to the Niger, and proceeding down that river on board a canoe. The volume is a fascinating and amazing story of adventure and misadventure in the desert and on the river, during a period of sixteen months. He was never long out of touch with the followers of Islam. His testimony is that its speedy spread throughout Asia and Africa is due to the powerful personal witness of its individual members. 'Trading for a livelihood they are missionaries all the time, without a stated salary, official connexion, or headquarters.'

Lifelong Influence of the Bible.

'The book I read first and most, the one with which I became intimately acquainted as a child, was the "Book of Books," the Holy Bible. I never wearied of poring over its sacred pages. . . . I believed it without reserve, mental or otherwise, and accepted it as the infallible and unerring guide for this life, as well as for the life to come. . . . Thus it was that the eternal truths of the Bible first fascinated, and later came to mould and dominate my life for over forty years. They called me to repentance and faith in the year 1886, restored my soul again and again when I strayed,

and wiped away the tears of bereavement as I stood by the open grave on four occasions in Africa. They brought help in difficulties, strength in weakness, comfort in sorrow, and companionship as I trod the lone trails of Darkest Africa. They now urge me to further exploits and explorations, they give me wisdom and tact in seeking to win souls for the Saviour, and they strengthen my hope as I go forward sowing seed-furrows throughout Widest Africa.'

February.

The S.C.M. Press publishes *A Gardener's Prayer Book*, 'Being a Few Prayers and Thoughts from the Lessons we learn of Flowers and Trees in a Garden,' by M. L. W. (2s. 6d. net). It is a small book, but it is attractive to handle, with its green boards and green paper covers, as befits the subject. It makes attractive reading too. On one page is the prayer or meditation suitable for the season, and opposite it a poetic quotation. This is the February one :

Deep sleeps the winter, cold, wet and grey ;
Surely all the world is dead ; spring is far away.
Wait ! The world shall waken, it is not dead,
for lo,

The Fair Maids of February stand in the snow.

Flower Fairies of the Spring,

C. M. BARKER.

THE SNOWDROP.

O Father of life, Lover of purity, who madest the little snowdrop to spring up out of the earth in the midst of darkest winter, faithfully braving all wind, snow, and cruel frost ; grant that we too may rise victorious above the darkness and evils of this sinful world, and be clothed with purity. May we, like the snowdrop, bear humble and faithful witness to Thee. Make us brave to face all temptation, knowing that Thou art ever with us to protect and strengthen us. We ask this, O Father, for the sake of Jesus Christ, our Lord. AMEN.

¹ D. Campbell, *Wanderings in Widest Africa*, 18.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.